DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 529 EA 026 103

TITLE Stop the Violence!: I Want to Learn. Discussing Solutions.
INSTITUTION California State Legislature, Sacramento. Senate Subcommittee on School Safety.
PUB DATE 15 Nov 93
NOTE 107p.
PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Crime; Early Intervention; Elementary Secondary Education; *Prevention; *School Safety; *School Security; State Action; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This document contains the testimony and materials presented at the California State Senate Subcommittee on School Safety hearing held at California State University, Northridge, on November 15, 1993. The purpose of the hearing was to examine different school safety programs and hear witnesses' recommendations to stop violence in the schools. Testimony was given by participants from the following programs: the Commission on Teacher Credentialing; Peace Builders; Weapons Are Removed Now (WARN); Straight Talk About Risks (STAR); the California Wellness Foundation; the Community Board Program; and Project Yes! (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE
ON
SCHOOL SAFETY

SENATOR TERESA P. HUGHES
CHAIRMAN

STOP THE VIOLENCE!: I WANT TO LEARN
DISCUSSING SOLUTIONS

NOVEMBER 15, 1993

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE
SATELLITE STUDENT UNION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL .....

LIST OF EXPERT WITNESSES .....

TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY .....

I. OPENING STATEMENT 1

II. COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING 8

III. PEACE BUILDERS 24

IV. W.A.R.N. 33

V. STAR 46

VI. CALIFORNIA WELLNESS FOUNDATION 59

VII. COMMUNITY BOARD PROGRAM 65

VIII. "PROJECT YES!" 78

SACRAMENTO OFFICE
STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 445 2104

DISTRICT OFFICE
ONE MANCHESTER BOULEVARD
SUITE 401
INGLEWOOD CA 90301
(310) 412 0393

California State Senate

SENATOR
TERESA P. HUGHES
TWENTY-FIFTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEES

CHAIR PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT AND RETIREMENT

ENERGY AND PUBLIC UTILITIES

GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

CHAIR SELECT COMMITTEE ON TEENAGE PREGNANCY

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN THE WORKFORCE

April 22, 1994

Honorable Bill Lockyer
President Pro Tempore of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 205
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator Lockyer:

The attached documents represent the testimony and materials presented at the Senate Subcommittee on School Safety hearing held at California State University, Northridge on November 15, 1993.

The hearing examined different school safety programs.

Witnesses at the hearing made a number of recommendations which will help shape solutions to the violence in schools.

I am confident that the Legislature will find this information useful as it formulates the goals of the Senate Subcommittee on School Safety.

Additional copies of this publication may be purchased for $5.93 including tax. Please make checks payable to Senate Rules Committee and send your requests to Senate Publications: 1020 N Street, Room B53, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Sincerely,

Teresa P. Hughes

TERESA P. HUGHES
Chair, The Senate Subcommittee on School Safety
Members: Senator Hart, Senator Watson & Senator Wright

SACRAMENTO OFFICE
STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 445-2104

DISTRICT OFFICE
ONE MANCHESTER BOULEVARD
SUITE 401
INGLEWOOD CA 90301
(310) 412-0393

California State Senate

SENATOR
TERESA P. HUGHES
TWENTY-FIFTH SENATORIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEES

CHAIR PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT AND RETIREMENT

ENERGY AND PUBLIC UTILITIES

GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

CHAIR SELECT COMMITTEE ON TEENAGE PREGNANCY

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN THE WORKFORCE

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON
SCHOOL SAFETY
STOP THE VIOLENCE!: I WANT TO LEARN
DISCUSSING SOLUTIONS
NOVEMBER 15, 1993
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE
SATELLITE STUDENT UNION
9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
CO-SPONSORED BY
CALIFORNIA SCHOOL BOARD ASSOCIATION
CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
GTE CALIFORNIA INCORPORATED

OPENING STATEMENT
Senator Teresa P. Hughes, Chair

WELCOME ADDRESS

Dr. Blenda Wilson
President, California State University, Northridge

Kathleen Brown
California State Treasurer

PROGRAMS THAT WORK!!
Part 1

10:00 a.m.-10:30 a.m.
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Joseph Dear, Consultant

10:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.
"Peace Builders"
Inland Agency
Julie Johnson, Director of Public Relations
Fanisha Lyons, "9-year-old pariticipant, Peace Builders"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

11:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.
"Weapons Are Removed Now" W.A.R.N.
Jay Shaffer, Cabinet Director
Robert Kladifko, Principal
Debbie Carlos, Student
Reseda High School

11:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon
Audience Participation/Comments

12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.
Lunch Break

PROGRAMS THAT WORK!!
Part 2

1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.
"Straight Talk About Risks" (STAR)
Sandy Cooney
Director of Western Regional Operations

1:30 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.
California Wellness Foundation
Darwin Farrar, Director of Policy
Pacific Center for Violence Prevention

2:00 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.
"Community Board Program"
Irene Cooper-Basch
Director of Development & Communication

2:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.
"PROJECT YES!"
Daria Waetjen, Program Coordinator

3:00 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.
Audience Participation/Comments

3:45 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.
Closing Comments from Senate Subcommittee Members

SENATOR TERESA P. HUGHES, CHAIR: I am Senator Teresa Hughes, Chair of the Senate Subcommittee on School Safety.

I'd like to take this opportunity to thank you for your presence and participation in today's dialogue. I'd like to especially thank President Wilson, on whose campus we are meeting, and then thanks to my fellow colleagues and committee members -- Senator Cathie Wright and I hope to be joined by Senator Gary Hart later -- for being with us today; as well as our State Treasurer, Kathleen Brown; and representing U.S. Attorney General, Janet Reno; Western Regional Director for the U.S. Department of Justice, Julian Klugman.

I am especially appreciative to those of you who will be testifying and also the California State School Board Association, the California Teachers Association, and GT California, Inc., all of whom have contributed a great deal to today's hearing.

Today, we are here in an effort to save our children. Schools are increasingly becoming a battleground for children as they are no longer safe in school. The severity of school violence varies from school to school and district to district. It is incorrect for anyone to think that the issue of school violence is one that plagues only the inner-city schools. This is a problem that's affecting schools all over our state and across the nation.

Today, the hearing will focus on discussing solutions to school violence from the perspective of prevention and intervention programs and studies from across the state.

Individuals who will testify will share information with us on how and why the strategies they employ within their program should be pursued in an effort to reverse the alarming rise in violence which is taking place on our school campuses all over the State of California.

There will be an opportunity to hear public comments at the end of both sessions today. We may not be able to hear from all of you. However, written feedback and comments may also be mailed to our Subcommittee in Sacramento.

We will now begin with the welcome from the President of the University, Dr. Blenda Wilson; followed by some remarks from our State Treasurer, Kathleen Brown, and then we will proceed with further presenters.

Dr. Wilson.

DR. BLENDA WILSON: Thank you very much. It is indeed my pleasure to welcome Senator Teresa Hughes, Senator Cathie Wright, and the members of the Senate Subcommittee on School Safety to the campus of California State University, Northridge. We are delighted to be the site for this very

important public hearing.

The problem of violence in our schools is accelerating exponentially, and the need for solutions is urgent. Learning cannot take place if children are afraid to go to school.

Headlines from our local newspapers recently give you a sense of the extent of this problem: From the San Jose Mercury News an article, "Why Schools Increasingly Call On Police." From the Los Angeles Times, "The World of Fear." Sacramento Union, "School Tenses After Student's Beating." San Francisco Chronicle, "Firearm Deaths Rising Among U.S. Teenagers." The San Diego Union Tribune, "City Schools Crack Down On Weapons."

Throughout California in all of our cities, not only in Los Angeles, not only in cities but in suburbs, these headlines are chilling testimony to the fact that the schools in California are not safe places for learning.

California State University, Northridge, as a major producer of teachers for the Los Angeles School District, has a major interest and stake in finding solutions to this problem. Making our schools safe, however, is the task which involves all of us.

This public forum provides a unique opportunity for educators, public officials, concerned parents and citizens and school children themselves to come together to address public policy issues around school safety, and to propose and discuss ideas that are realistic, flexible and accountable.

Senator Hughes and members of the Senate Subcommittee, welcome to California State University, Northridge. Please know that your work here today is very valued and very critical to us all.

Thank you.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you very much, Madam President.

I'd appreciate it if our State Treasurer, Kathleen Brown will come to the podium and face the audience and make your remarks.

MS. KATHLEEN BROWN: Thank you, Senator Hughes, and it is good to have you here, and you as well, Senator Wright. This is a wonderful facility. I had to ask when I came in, I asked Dr. Wilson if we built this with those bonds, and I'm happy to see that it has produced such an outstanding facility that can host community events such as this.

I would like to say it is my pleasure to be here today, but it is never a pleasure to come to speak about a topic as wrenching as that of school violence. But I welcome the opportunity to contribute in some way to this discussion and hopefully contribute in some way to solutions to the problem of school violence.

I think that the topic which you're dealing with today, Senator Hughes, is

literally a life and death issue for not only California's public schools but for California's children.

And I want to thank Dr. Wilson because she has made a tremendous contribution. She has not been in California for that many years. The amount of time that she has spent here she has contributed enormously to the educational leadership of the next generation of education leaders, and I thank you for your work in the area of education reform.

A few weeks ago I met with a group of students from two high schools here in Los Angeles, and when I asked them to name their number one concern with their schools I expected them to say teachers, curriculum, not enough books. These were the things that I'd read about and you hear about so often. But when they named that one thing, these high school students from different schools in Los Angeles almost to a one said "school safety."

Small wonder. Because when you go to look at the statistics, in Los Angeles alone 153 guns were recovered in the school district or at extra curricular events just last year. There were also 330 reports of students being assaulted with deadly weapons; 409 misdemeanor and felony sex offenses; and 451 robberies. And just yesterday, in the Los Angeles Daily News there was a front-page story about families in the Van Nuys' Blythe Street neighborhood who earn $300 a week as their family income and spend $200 of it a month for a vanpool which will take their kids to school in safety.

The problem is not limited to any single community. When I was in Sacramento just a few weeks ago I spoke with the father of a kindergartner who said he could hear gunfire as he picked his children up and dropped them off at school. And nationally, 160,000 children stay home from school because they are afraid of school violence.

Reforming our schools starts with making them safe, and if we fail to do so the failure of our education system is all but guaranteed.

About ten days ago I unveiled a comprehensive plan to reform California's schools because I believe if we are to get California's economy moving again education is the key. Our state's economy cannot fully recover unless we reform the education system. Businesses will not come to, nor will they stay in, California unless children are properly educated for the future. And workers cannot be productive unless they have the skills to operate equipment and think their way through a problem.

But let's be honest. Computers, relevant curricula, 21st century technology, modern teaching techniques, and all the other elements of a model education system are of little use if our schools are not drug free and safe. Children can't learn when they're afraid for their lives or when they're

tempted by drugs.

So fighting crime and drugs in school requires a comprehensive effort that runs the gamut from prevention to punishment. It requires community support. It requires parental involvement. And it involves law enforcement participation. And it must be grounded in the notion of zero tolerance of guns and drugs. We cannot look the other way, we cannot excuse the first offense, and we cannot make exceptions. Students who bring guns to school must face certain consequences.

But we've got to use some common sense as well. We have to punish kids who carry weapons into the classroom, but sending them into the streets uneducated and unsupervised will simply produce a generation of uneducated youths who carry weapons on the streets, and that is not in anyone's interest.

So what happens right now is many children are caught carrying guns to school. They are simply released or sent home on probation. At the same time, the school district expels them. So these kids end up both unpunished and uneducated. They won't learn how to read or get a job but they will learn that violating the law does not have serious consequences. It is one perverse lesson.

I have proposed to change that. When kids are caught with guns and are sentenced by the juvenile system to home probation or are let go without any probation they should be required to attend a special county disciplinary school for up to one year. These schools will educate kids but they will also provide punishment, prevention and counseling. Students will attend for 10 hours a day, 6 days a week. In addition to the regular school curriculum, they will receive intensive anti-drug education, hear from ex-gang members, visit prisons, hospital emergency rooms, yes, coroners' offices and morgues because they need to learn what guns can do. They'll be taught how to resolve conflicts and they'll work, cleaning up graffiti or doing other forms of community service. Finally, their parents will be required to be involved in their rehabilitation and education.

I have suggested that these schools be named in memory of Demetrius Rice and Michael Ensley -- two students in the Los Angeles Unified School District who were shot and killed at schools earlier this year. They were in school doing what they were supposed to be doing and they became the victims of this random senseless violence. Their mothers have told me that these schools, these alternative disciplinary schools to get the kids off the street are one of the things that they think will make a difference, and they have joined with a group called Mothers Against Violence in Schools to begin to raise some of these issues and propose some of these solutions.

The Ensley-Rice academies would be eligible to receive state education funds which would cover about $5,000 of the $12,000 annual cost per student. The remaining amount would be financed with administrative savings, which I'll describe in a moment. I propose that the facilities themselves for the Ensley-Rice program be financed with a $100 million bonding authority, part of a $300 million school safety and classroom technology bond act similar to a measure proposed by Assemblywoman Delaine Eastin. To help fight violence these bonds would also provide $100 million for other security measures like metal detectors, cameras and other new school safety equipment. The bonds would fit within the debt management plan which is currently in place to ensure that the state's bonded indebtedness remains manageable.

We must also extend the reach of laws against carrying guns on campus to other areas where children congregate, including areas around schools, parks, playgrounds, youth centers and recreation areas. Currently, it is only a misdemeanor and the violator is often not prosecuted. I support making this crime a felony with penalties identical to those for carrying firearms in schools. Those sentenced to probation or less would be sent to the Ensley-Rice schools.

But making schools safe will require much more than simply reacting after the fact. It will also take prevention, especially anti-drug and alcohol education. As a sergeant in the Anti-Gang Unit covering Watts told me a few weeks ago, "Anti-drug education programs like D.A.R.E. and S.A.N.E.(?) do work but there simply aren't enough of these programs to go around."

We have got to provide anti-drug education to every kid in every school, and we must increase the number of times they get the message. The state used to spend $30 million a year in support of anti-drug education. That funding was cut in 1992. We should restore that funding and increase it to $50 million a year. It will help keep thousands of kids from going down the path of drugs and guns and gangs.

The programs which I have suggested obviously cost money, but I believe that they can be financed within the current education budget. According to the Department of Finance school districts in the state spend 23 cents on administration for every dollar they spend on instruction. But the most efficient districts spend as little as 16 cents -- 30 percent less than the statewide average. So I have proposed that the state limit each district's administrative expenses to 20 cents for every dollar spent on instruction, an average cut of about 13 percent. That would free up more than $411 million. More than enough to pay for the operating cost of the Ensley-Rice academies and the anti-drug education.

These administrative cuts also generate enough savings to pay for the other programs which I have proposed to prepare kids for the workplace of the 21st century.

Senator Hughes, the work that you are doing here today is absolutely essential to the future of our school system and to our future Californians, and I applaud and congratulate you for your efforts. I'd be honored to discuss these ideas with you in greater detail, and stand ready to assist you in any way possible.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to testify.

SENATOR CATHIE WRIGHT: Madam Chair, may I ask the Treasurer a question?

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, she doesn't have any time for questions. She's on a very tight schedule.

SENATOR WRIGHT: It'll only take a few moments.

MS. BROWN: I'm happy to answer questions.

SENATOR WRIGHT: The one question I'd like to ask you, you sat on the Los Angeles Unified School District, did you not?

MS. BROWN: Yes, I did.

SENATOR WRIGHT: At that time I believe there was a problem starting then with this violence in the schools: there'd been some attacks on teachers. It was quite evident of what was going on. Did you propose any of these proposals at that particular time to the board?

MS. BROWN: As a matter of fact, I did, Senator Wright. I proposed and supported initiatives to put school police on campus, increase their numbers. I supported the efforts, very controversial at the time, of undercover agents to weed out drug sales in the Los Angeles Unified School District. And I supported those efforts to increase anti-violence and anti-crime curriculum. I'd be happy to provide you with the series of steps that I took.

SENATOR WRIGHT: What was the approach of the board at that time to your proposals?

MS. BROWN: Some of those efforts were supported, some were not supported, but I felt very strongly at that time about the issue, and still do. How one cannot move to do all that is necessary to stop a crime and violence on school campuses, not to mention outside of school campuses, is really unthinkable. So I was very active in that area.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Well, I appreciate that, but I think for thirteen years -- have seen the problem started at least thirteen years ago, if not more, and I would have hoped that you would have pursued your proposals over those thirteen years.

MS. BROWN: I very actively did so. Be happy to share those with you.

Thank you very much, Senator.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you. And let me say this, the problem is much more acute now than it was thirteen years ago.

SENATOR WRIGHT: But would have cost a lot less to start it thirteen years ago.

SENATOR HUGHES: Yes, true. But one person can't do it all by themselves. It's also interesting that the Treasurer said that at that time she supported the undercover law enforcement people on campuses, and it's interesting now that in L.A. Unified they have now gone back to the policy of having uniformed police officers on campuses to make students feel more secure.

So then was then and now is now. The situation is different now and the approaches have to be different now. So we can't look back, we must look forward and we must look forward to the next 24 hours, not only the next year or two or decade. And so the approaches that we have today may or may not be the same kind of approaches that we have tomorrow.

Certainly, Senator Wright, you know that our children are afraid. If children see someone in a uniform they'll feel that it's a little safer place in which to be. I understand that. I also understand how the need was years ago to have undercover agents in school. But if you are a young person in a school by yourself, without your parents, without anyone to protect you, you want to know that there's someone you can readily identify.

So we must not blame each other. We must blame ourselves if we don't get our acts together. And we're going to work on this. I know we're going to work on this on a bipartisan effort. We don't want just people from our political party to be safe. We want all of our children to be safe. And you and I are going to work on this and you and I are going to be coauthors on some of this legislation.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Then, Senator, I would hope that not only you but the Treasurer would also support legislation that I have in Judiciary Committee right now that I could not get out, that was supported by the Attorney General, in regards to making safe zones around the schools and I couldn't get the support to even have a hearing in committee on the bill. So I'm very pleased that the Treasurer and you and a lot of others are suddenly jumping on the bandwagon of something that's violence today but could have been prevented certainly thirteen years ago.

SENATOR HUGHES: I agree with you. Can't agree with you more. And that's why I enjoy working with you because you and I have the same goals and objectives, no matter what our party designations are, and no one should be amazed or surprised that we are friends and that we see eye to eye on these

issues.

SENATOR WRIGHT: That's true, or I wouldn't be here.

SENATOR HUGHES: That's right, and I know that.

Now, our next witness is from the Commission on Teaching Credentialing who wants to tell us something about a program that he has. Joseph Dear.

MR. JOSEPH DEAR: Good morning.

Madam Chair, Senators, distinguished presenters and guests, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to share with you the work of the Commission's Advisory Panel on School Violence. My name is Joseph Dear and I'm a consultant with the Commission.

You might recall it was through a bill that originated in your own chambers three years ago -- SB 2460 -- by the then Senator Cecil Green that directed the Commission to take a leadership role in addressing this issue.

The panel met just about every month from May to November of last year, familiarizing themselves with one another's work and the panel's mission, discussing philosophy and belief statements that eventually led to the development of a common set of assumptions from which the panel's work would be guided, and planning strategies that would ultimately lead to the final recommendations the Commission will actually expect to have early next year.

Since one of the first tasks of the panel was to collect data, surveys were developed and administered to -- there were several surveys. One was to 72 colleges and universities in the State of California to credential program coordinators, another survey was to the credential candidates themselves, another survey was to recently credentialed school teachers, administrators, counselors, psychologists and other school support personnel. Another survey was to the California School Board members. In an attempt to find out what other states are doing to address this problem and to avoid reinventing the wheel, we sent surveys to the Commission's counterpart in other states and received responses from all 49 states and the District of Columbia, and over 360 colleges and university teacher training program coordinators throughout the United States also responded to a survey about the preparedness of their students to school violence.

In addition to collecting survey data, we held focus group meetings throughout the state. Most panelists agree that talking with junior high school students in small groups for an hour-and-a-half and then high school students and students from continuation schools in similar small groups was probably the most exciting, even though the other focus group meetings were also fruitful.

The panel visited eleven different counties from throughout the state and

talked with over 600 students, parents, teachers, administrators and support staff, law enforcement and other community persons in small groups, homogeneous and informal discussions during the month of January last year.

After all the data was collected the panel enlisted 6 graduate students from the Division of Social Work at California State University to assist us in our work, and they made this their Master's thesis program.

Before I talk about the findings of the panel, I must emphasize to you that what I am sharing with you today is a mere draft of what the panel will be sharing next month when we return to those same 11 counties where the original focus group meetings were held.

The panel findings can be grouped in three parts: First, findings from the focus groups; second, findings from the survey questionnaires; and finally, findings from the review of the literature, contacts with program coordinators and correspondence with experts in the field.

Panelists asked four basic questions in each focus group. The first one was: What violence have you experienced in relatively recent times? Asking that no hearsay or gossip be shared but what have you actually experienced or know for certain happened. The second question was: What do you think caused the violence? The third: What do you think can be done to address school violence? And finally: What training do you feel educators need to effectively address school violence?

Comments from the focus group participants as a total included the most violent activities experienced by them were, number one, fights. Second most frequent response was gang related activities. The third was verbal abuse such as teasing, swearing, name calling. The fourth was the brandishing of weapons. And the fifth, there was a tie between racial incidence and various kinds of assaults.

Responses to the second question, which was, What do you think caused the violence? The first was ethnic and cultural ignorance. The second was gangs. The third was media, such as movies, TV, music, video, games. And other causes mentioned include the lack of values and respect, low self-esteem, non-equipped staffs, and dysfunctional families.

Responses to the question of, What can be done to address school violence? The first, and very prominent answer by most of the people, was implementing multi-cultural curriculum. The second was involving community agencies and law enforcement in school partnerships. The third was enforce discipline policies consistently and fairly. Other potential solutions mentioned were show concern and interest for students, improve internal and external communication, and teach conflict resolution, problem solving, and crisis intervention skills to

both students and school staffs.

Responses to the last question of, What training do you feel is needed for school staffs to effectively address school violence? were, number one, training about multi-cultural sensitivity and awareness. Number two, conflict management and resolution. Other suggestions were training in communication and interpersonal skills, listening and other counseling skills, and classroom management and discipline.

The second set of data was from survey questionnaires. We were somewhat surprised by our findings. Data from our surveys show very clearly that contrary to popular opinion and other literature review, teachers and other educators do not feel violence in their schools to be a big problem. The results also show that teachers and other educators worry comparatively little about their own personal safety. These findings were fairly consistent among all educators, including teachers, administrators, support personnel such as counselors, school psychologists and social workers, from California as well as from those throughout the United States. These same findings were even consistent among credential candidates and candidate program coordinators whose field experiences were completed in K-12 schools in California and, again, throughout the United States.

These same teachers, administrators and educators, however, felt very strongly that special training to address school violence is very much needed for themselves and others. They felt very strongly that they were unprepared to address school violence as they went through their training programs, and the vast majority said that they receive very little or no training.

SENATOR HUGHES: Mr. Dear, would you go back to where you made a remark, because I need further clarification, about teachers and educators do not feel that violence is a problem in their schools.

MR. DEAR: That's right. We were surprised as well to get that.

SENATOR HUGHES: How recent did you get that information?

MR. DEAR: About seven months ago.

SENATOR HUGHES: It's always someone else's school, it's not their school, when they read about the violence up and down and across the state?

MR. DEAR: We were very surprised to get that information. It's interesting that most of the people who responded to the surveys, there were very few who said that their -- we asked the question: Was it a big problem, just a problem, a middle-sized problem, a little problem, or a very little problem? There were almost none in the very big problem.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Did you send this very same questionnaire to the schools where you know there have been murders in the schools, there have

been violence in the schools, and then did those same schools respond that, no, there wasn't? I'm wondering who these people are that are returning the surveys and if there was a significant number of people in the schools that did not return the surveys. You're talking about just the surveys that were returned. How many did you have that did not respond?

MR. DEAR: There were a number who didn't respond. When we went into the schools, and we did come to L.A., and held the focus groups, in terms of the focus groups as well as the surveys the findings were fairly consistent. There were, however, as we talked to people in the focus group, there were few more who said that it was a problem. But even then the vast majority of the people we talked to, and I'm talking about teachers, administrators, parents, counselors and students themselves, most of them said that it was not a big problem. And, again, we were very surprised. Yet, as they said that there was not a problem, all of them, the vast majority -- I'm talking about 80-90 percent -- said that they feel that there should be training and that they did not receive such a training. And over 60 percent said that they themselves felt that they wanted to go back and receive training.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. In your questionnaires that you sent out, did you require that people sign their names to them?

MR. DEAR: No.

SENATOR HUGHES: Because I was wondering if they felt threatened by it.

MR. DEAR: No, no. As a matter of fact, we even provided an envelope for them to send the responses back to us, postage paid envelopes, and we kept no record, and of course, at the end of the survey we stated they would be responding anonymously.

SENATOR HUGHES: How many of these surveys that were returned to you did you feel were truly answered honestly or were colored by some sort of school loyalty to their employers?

MR. DEAR: As we talked to the people, most people felt that as they see their own school -- it might have been out of the pride of their own school but many of them felt that at their school it wasn't a big problem.

And I guess what I was going to say later is that it seems, again, that many of the people take violence almost for granted. It's really too bad that they don't see the problems even though they know they exist, but in their own schools they seem to think that, well, a fight is expected, or you know, a little harassment is expected, or these other things that are violent.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Now, in your survey did you use the word "violence" per se or, you know, is a stabbing or a shooting or a blood-letting of any type different than just a fight where there's no bloodshed? I mean,

were you very clear in your definition of violence? Was that part of the problem?

MR. DEAR: In one of the surveys, we made a list of the different incidences. We asked on a scale of, like, 1 to 5, the number of incidences that you have experienced and that you have seen happen on your campus, and yes, we had that very list of violence with a weapon and we even said with a pipe or gun or a knife or some other kind of a weapon. And we talked about the verbal violence that they might have or pushing and shoving. So we had probably a list of about 20 or 25 different kinds of violence that they could respond to, and again, we were very surprised that the perception of many of the educators were that their school is not that bad.

SENATOR HUGHES: Then did you go back to any of the schools in point like Fairfax High School or Reseda or any place like that where you know there was violence, the teachers know it, the public knows it? Did you have this survey in those schools after the incidences?

MR. DEAR: We didn't go to those schools, for instance. What we did in the L.A. County is we got the County Office of Education to help us to identify schools that they thought they had problems and they went to those schools and held the hearings. We are going back, incidentally, next month.

SENATOR HUGHES: Are you going back to the schools that the county recommends that you go to, or are you going to do an at random yourself to get the real story?

MR. DEAR: Actually, we're going back to the same places that we went so that we can share with those who we got the information from.

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, I might say to you that you're just pushing extra papers and going on a merry-go-round where you're going to come out to the exact same place.

I would suggest to you that it would be more scientific, since you are a researcher, and I have done a little research in my day, too, in academia, for you to do at random type places, not places that you're going to alert the county that you're coming in to their schools to do the survey, so then the teachers and the administrators and the classified staff knows that you are the people that are being examined. The IRS doesn't do that when they decide that they're going to audit your tax return. They don't send you a letter and say we're going to do an audit, get everything straight; they just, boom, they do an audit and they found out information that they need to find out. I think that you should do that kind of thing if you are indeed to be helpful to us, helpful to the Commission, helpful to the government for which you're working, that you do an at random thing, that you don't advertise it everywhere that

we're coming, we're sending the surveys. Once, yes, true. Once you send the surveys you have to recapture the information. Then it's the time to go and say please give us back your information. But I think your approach of asking the county to identify doesn't give you the kinds of results that you want. If you think about it I think you realize that it's not surprising why you got some of the responses that you did.

Senator Wright.

SENATOR WRIGHT: What you're telling us is that in doing your research, or your survey that you did junior high, high school, and continuation schools?

MR. DEAR: We had Mr. Gus Freias -- I don't know if you know Gus. He is at the county office and he works with youth gangs and has for the last decade and a half. Gus identified the schools that we were to go to to have the focus groups.

In terms of the surveys themselves, the surveys were, again, sent to the credential -- there was several surveys. One was to recently credentialed candidates and they were random. The Commission actually identified people who were credentialed in 1991 and randomly chose a group of teachers, administrators, counselors and others. The ones that we got from the universities -- we sent the survey to all 72 colleges and universities in this state and had the professors respond as well as their students, who are doing their student teaching all over the state. They also stated that as they were doing all their student teaching and their field experience that they were not finding the schools to have a lot of violence.

Again, we were extremely surprised and we do plan to -- of course, any time you find something that surprising that is a red flag for you to go back and continue to go back to make sure that you confirm that this is not a fluke or just confounding situations that's skewing the data. So we will go back and I'll certainly take your suggestion of trying to find other ways of bestowing it.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I'd like you to bear with me for a moment on what I feel and then respond to that.

It seems to me that what you're saying is that one of the ways to help this problem that we have that's grown over the years, because it didn't just start yesterday, is that we have to have multi-cultural education programs. And I have to tell you that I don't believe that, and I'll tell you why.

Prejudice is not born with the child. It learns it later on. Because I feel very strongly about that I also feel that if we're going to go in to a classroom and you're going to start in the junior/senior high schools or in the continuation schools, the prejudice is already built in, for one reason or

another. And I think sometimes it is because we have all these special programs. I think your culture is at home with your family. I think one of the problems is so many youngsters today do not have whole families. I think if you're going to do anything you're going to start kindergarten, first grade, second grade not with bicultural programs but just accepting each other.

I have examples that I go back in my lifetime to, and some of our decisions and our philosophies are based on what we have gone through growing up. I come from a small town in Pennsylvania that do we have prejudices? Sure. Italians against the Polish, against the Irish, against the English because we did not have that many Black families. In fact, we didn't have any Black families in my little town but we had some Jewish people, you know. The only thing we held against the Jewish people was because the youngsters had holidays right after we started school and so they got a couple of days off and we didn't like that. But it was never violence because they had some differences. And I can recall my little cousin who was 3 years old, we went to Atlantic City, because that was the closest beach, and for the five days that we were there, he played with three of the cutest little Black children you ever saw and they played together and there was no problem. There was no problem.

SENATOR HUGHES: I just want to know, did they play on the beach? Because I was raised back East when Black people couldn't go on the beach in Atlantic City.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Then you must be older than I am, Teresa!

SENATOR HUGHES: They played on the boardwalk. They didn't play on the beach. I just wanted to correct that.

SENATOR WRIGHT: No, they played on the beach. They were on the beach.

SENATOR HUGHES: On the boardwalk.

SENATOR WRIGHT: On the beach. They played in the sand. They played in the sand on the beach. And my daughter the same way out here in California. One of her closest friends was a Black girl and she would go over to their house because they would have special dishes that she liked to eat that mother, as an Italian, didn't prepare.

So I really think that instead of teaching differences that we should be teaching and starting very early before they get prejudiced because of differences, that we teach them how we're alike and our sameness. And I'd like you to respond to what you think about some sort of positive approach in the earlier school curricula rather than waiting until the high schools and the junior high schools and continuation schools, which seems to be what you're approaching right now. It seems to me that's what the end result is going to be and I'd like you to respond to it.

MR. DEAR: You know, frankly, I agree with you about the special programs being on the outside. I think curricula should be infused, and I certainly agree that rather than showing differences, we are more alike than we are different. And I think kids who learn together and learn to share ideas and play things, and everything that they do together as they're learning English, they can learn how they are similar in so many ways. Unfortunately, multi-cultural curriculum conjure up the thought of showing differences, but I know so many teachers and other educators who do it beautifully as a part of -- I mean, you'd never know that they're talking about differences. They're really just sharing information. I mean, you need to learn about cultures anyway. Why not learn as you're learning English and math and science and history and other things so it's just a natural part of the curriculum, and as they see that they have differences that might be generated from their differences, then they can -- in many cases, teachers, and I've seen teachers do this too, use those incidences to show that the difference is not something that they need to fight over, but to show the similarities that they have and use those kinds of examples as teaching tools so that when kids do have differences, whether it's out of racial or ethnic or just differences because I want my way and you want yours, help them to find ways to settle those differences in other ways other than through violence.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Because I guess my problem is that it appears to me we're kind of heading on a path of what we do so well, which is reaction instead of prevention, and I think prevention starts in the very beginning by showing the positives, how much we are alike, how much mothers all over this nation, all over this world have the same goal: a better life for their children.

SENATOR HUGHES: I couldn't agree with you more. Another point that I really agree with you on strongly, Senator Wright, is the fact that we wait too late to teach our children about the goodness of people that sit right next to them in school all day. Even though their dress may be different, their skin may be different, they have the same feelings, the wants and desires, and we don't teach those similarities enough. I think it should start exactly where you say, in early childhood education, in preschool before you get to school. But prejudice is a learned behavior and it's learned ofttimes from home and community. So even though you instruct the child, the child isn't mature enough to counteract the environment in which they are raised. If we really do the job that we're supposed to be dealing in education, we're preparing students to be inquisitive and to be leaders and productive members of our society. Maybe kids should be questioning their families sometimes: Mom, why can't I play with the boy next door or the girl next door just because they may

be of a different religion or a different race? I would hope that parents would be open-minded enough to answer those questions honestly, but the honest thing is that people are fearful of each other and we don't talk about that real fear.

You look at the Armed Forces and when people get on the battlefront together to survive, the prejudice then goes out the window. You look at our natural disasters, our earthquakes and our fires and no one questions whether their next door neighbor is Italian or Black or Hispanic. How can we help to save each other's homes. We're all here to survive. You're on an airplane and it's about to crash. Can I find the other people who are Black like me on this plane because they're the only ones I want to save. No. You're trying to save the person sitting next to you, you're trying to yourself, and that's what it's all about. And so maybe we should do more about instructing our children how to survive by living productively together. Maybe I don't like the color jacket that you wear but that's your jacket and you have the right to wear it. And this is my jacket and I have a right to wear that, too. But it performs the same service, it keeps us warm. Our food nourishes us.

So I think we have to start with the very basics. Ethnic studies and multi-cultural education are misplaced when we get to the university level because not that many people make the university or get that far in their education. And so maybe we talk about wiping out the violence that way and all people of the same ethnic group are not the same because they come from different regions of this country and different places in the motherland, whether it's Northern Italy, Southern Italy or what have you.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Hey, got to watch the loose division within the Italians. They fight all the time.

SENATOR HUGHES: That's true. And so, you see, we need not to talk about the divisions. We need to talk about the multiplications, the coming together.

SENATOR WRIGHT: We'll always fight because I think that's nature and if it is -- and I'll tell you again, I tell you, most of my decisions that I make are based on my background, my education, my philosophy, my family. It's a whole combination of everything to reach a final decision. And one of the things, again, it was my home town. You came from Italy you had different sections within my town. It was a very small town.

SENATOR HUGHES: Sure. I would have loved to have played with you on the beach in Atlantic City but we would never have been on the same sand at the same time. So it's just one of those things.

Now, let's let the witness get along with his testimony. We're revealing too much of ourselves.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Hey, that's all right.

But where does teacher credentialing come in to this whole thing, or is it just because you served on that panel?

MR. DEAR: Well, your body directed us to take a leadership role back in...

SENATOR WRIGHT: In other words, you're taking the lead on this. Who else was on this panel?

MR. DEAR: I'm sorry?

SENATOR WRIGHT: On this commission or panel that you've been serving on, this task force.

MR. DEAR: Who else was on it, did you say?

SENATOR WRIGHT: Yeah. I mean, what other areas?

SENATOR HUGHES: He's a staff person with the Commission who was charged with implementing the study that we mandated. Okay?

SENATOR WRIGHT: But he didn't do it all by himself.

MR. DEAR: No, no.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Who else was involved?

MR. DEAR: There was a panel that was appointed and the panel was made up of 20 different people. The panel had, for instance, county representatives, university representatives, other leaders in the business community. We had educators, of course. Teachers, students. We had administrators, the Chief of Police of L.A. Unified School District was on it and four representatives from government agencies. The Department of Education, the Youth Authority, the Office of Criminal Justice Planning, the Attorney General's Office. So, I mean, we had a very well rounded group on the panel.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Thank you.

MR. DEAR: I might mention that the findings from the review of the literature contacts with program coordinators' correspondence from experts in the field cited many things that, of course, many of us already know. Having the school rules that are clear, fair, and firmly and consistently enforced, and rules that are thoroughly communicated was really important to everyone involved with the school. Everyone is always involved in establishing the rules and student involvement was critical.

Another finding was responding appropriately and consistently to student behavior. One of the things that one of the researchers said is, "Good behavior is encouraged and receives positive consequences, and bad behavior is discouraged and receives negative consequences." This oftentimes will require training and continuous communication with students to make sure that they know the difference.

Using academic grades as punishment, such as lowering a student's grade as

a disciplinary matter, was consistently cited as not being a good idea. Sometimes, however, a student's grade is based upon things like playing fair or working cooperatively together and other performance requirements. In those cases appropriate behavior is part of the grading criteria. One example cited was the lowering of a student's grade in a math class because the student hit another in class is not a good idea, as was stated, nor should the student's misbehavior be ignored.

Other findings reveal that there is a great variety of efforts underway that are worthy of being mentioned, such as just good solid school-based practices, Various partnerships with schools and law enforcement, with schools and social service agencies, and schools with banks and grocery stores and other businesses. Unsolicited efforts by professional, social and civic organizations, local, state and national initiatives by ways of ordinances, legal statutes and financial support for pilot projects and the duplication of programs that really do work. There are a number of think tanks in private foundations and prominent institutions of higher education. All are contributing to the information pool of possible solutions.

SENATOR HUGHES: Mr. Dear, I'd like to interrupt you for one moment to introduce our colleague Senator Gary Hart, the Chair of the Senate Education Committee, from Santa Barbara. Senator Hart, thank you for being with us.

We have another question from Senator Wright.

SENATOR WRIGHT: You talked to the administrators of the different schools, did you not?

MR. DEAR: Yes, we did.

SENATOR WRIGHT: In any way did they ever say that there was something they wanted to try or something they wanted to do or some way they felt they could handle a situation and were unable to do it because of the rules, regulations or even laws that were in place that prohibit them from doing this?

MR. DEAR: Many of the administrators, we found, were bogged down with a lot of administrative work that they -- I mean, they were reacting. Most of them said that they just did not have time to do any pro-acting or do any of the things that they felt really could be productive ... number of things that they were going through in their schools.

SENATOR WRIGHT: But they didn't, for instance, say if I didn't have this report to fill out or if I really could have tried some sort of different kind of punishment rather than what I did do, or I felt that it would make a difference? I just feel that there's areas that if an administrator was given a little more flexibility or the teacher in the classroom also that could react at that particular moment something took place rather than realizing their

hands are tied and they can't and they have to follow a certain procedure, if any of that was brought up into the discussion.

MR. DEAR: Many of the administrators, as I mentioned, just felt overwhelmed by their day-to-day tasks of trying to carry out the functions of the schools, for the most part. Now, there were a few administrators who had creative ideas and had functional programs, as a matter of fact. We had several who were sharing programs that they started in their schools that actually work. Many of them, and I might even say most of them, were engaging young people to be involved in the school at every level. In many cases those administrators felt that they -- I mean, they were proud of the things that they were doing and proud to say that they used to have these problems and now they don't. So in many cases we were finding those kind of stories where they were finding some success.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I'm glad you mentioned the point about not reducing grades. That was not an action that really was productive for the simple reason, I'll say, if you're an A student, I'm sure that if you were knocked down to a B that would be terrible. That could maybe be punishment. But you take an average student, a C student or even a D student, knocking their grade down, if they don't have the enthusiasm and the desire to do better, reducing their grade doesn't mean anything to them.

MR. DEAR: And most of the literature agree with you on that in terms of using the grade as a punishment.

Several references were made and questions were asked about what responsible adults could do. One author asked the question, "Could you imagine what things would be like if all teachers were truly excited about their challenging work? If all administrators were enthusiastic, committed, and really gung ho about working with the teams of people he or she had on their staffs?"

Another wrote, "We grown folks must work on changing the perception educators have of their students and their coworkers. I can identify with that because of your perception of me. If your perception of me is that I'm lazy and can't be trusted or don't care or don't really have the potential, what could you expect of me possibly other than something low, shallow and negative. We act on our perceptions and our behavior is directed thusly. Working on the assumption that everyone can learn, educators would keep trying until they hit that balance and have the success."

Personally, I think that young people are the answer. As I conclude, the movement that I would see with great potential is one where we truly, truly engage the young people, where all young people have the definite and carefully

planned out role of addressing this and other problems. Our young people would need more role models who look like themselves, they need people who speak and who are the same size as them, doing things that matter. Young people could take the leadership in this. They can ask the questions straight up and they could get straight-up answers. We need to actively seek out those young people who are enthusiastic about learning and about getting involved. Many young people already know that learning is a process, sometimes short and sometimes long. We all probably know one or two young people who don't give up at the first sight of defeat or failure but who keep on believing and trying. Well, with some support they could teach other youngsters these same relatively simple concepts. High schoolers can look for contributing factors already working in their schools just as they can discover distracting factors that cause problems. We could help young people design and plan strategy to work on their school grounds. They could work with and identify other students to see where they fit. We could teach them how to focus one step at a time.

One thing we heard from all panelists, they were inspired by what the young people had to say. Well, I think we should go beyond being inspired. We need to listen to what they have to say. We should find a way to call the young people together and have them to assess the situation, talk with other young people and seek out their own solutions, of course with our support.

The next step, as I mentioned, that the panel will be doing is we'll be returning to those 11 sites, and Senator, I will take your advice to go to some of the other sites and share that information.

SENATOR HUGHES: That you decide to go on, not(?) that the county directs you to go to. Okay?

MR. DEAR: We will definitely go back and share and to some of those others and share with them.

We will hopefully have our report completed by early of next year with recommendations, and I will certainly be looking forward to hearing something from this group in terms of direction, which we will need fairly soon because we will be going back next month. But again, we're open to get whatever suggestions we can.

SENATOR WRIGHT: If I may, Madam Chair. I think as you go back again and you're talking to administrators, I really think one of the questions that should be asked is what do you feel that you're doing now that could be eliminated, that could free you up or give you the flexibility to try new programs and new approaches? Because the children are people that you deal with. Every section of the state is different, every community is different, everyone sees things differently, and I just think that the ability for

administrators to say, well, I'm not going to do this today because I really want to get into making some progress in regards to dealing with some violent issue that I see, or even just the pot starting to boil. You just have that feeling. If you're day in, day out in a school, you have a feeling, you can see what's brewing and you could cut it off before it even explodes. Question them on it.

MR. DEAR: Thank you.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you so very much for your testimony.

Before we get to the next group -- it's under the category we call Peace Builders -- I'd like for you to actually have an opportunity to see and hear from Janet Reno's representative who was kind enough to be with us this morning and I understand can't be with us too long. But I wanted to acknowledge, Mr. Klugman, your presence and have you come to either of the mikes and make any remarks. You've just gotten a flavor of what we are attempting to do as we gather testimony here to then go back to Sacramento and try to devise some legislative package to help us seek solution to our myriad of problems in violence. Would you like to make any remarks?

MR. JULIAN KLUGMAN: I don't have any written remarks. The U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno was invited to be here. She had a prior commitment in Washington.

As you know, this is an area that she also is extremely interested in, and the federal government is having hearings and trying to devise new ideas and new programs. I'm Regional Director of the Community Relations Service, U.S. Justice Department. I've been Regional Director for 23 years.

SENATOR HUGHES: Would you repeat your name so that we can get it on the recording?

MR. KLUGMAN: Sure. Julian Klugman, and I'm Regional Director of Community Relations Service.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Where are you based?

MR. KLUGMAN: San Francisco. It's Region 9. It covers California, Arizona, Nevada and Hawaii, but we spend a great deal of time in Los Angeles, particularly the last couple of years.

I was asked by Ms. Reno's chief of staff to come this morning to listen and to report back, and I am going to do that. Also, my own agency spends a great deal of time working in the schools and I'm particularly interested in hearing -- some of these programs I'm familiar with, some I'm not. I will be here. I can stay for the morning.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Excuse me. I don't think everyone can hear him. Can you? Could you speak a little louder, please, or eat the mike or something so

everyone can hear you?

MR. KLUGMAN: Okay. I was saying I've been Regional Director for 23 years, and we spend a lot of time in schools working with some of the problems that you're hearing about. Some of these programs, some of the witnesses I'm familiar with, like Community Board, some I'm not. So I'm particularly interested in hearing the testimony. I am going to write a report for Ms. Reno in terms of what I hear this morning.

SENATOR WRIGHT: And you're going to give us a copy.

SENATOR HUGHES: He has to give it to his boss first and if we're good girls we might get a copy, Cathie.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Then we're never going to get a copy, you know that. If you have to be good to get it you won't get it.

SENATOR HUGHES: I will.

SENATOR WRIGHT: As a cc [carbon copy].

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, thank you very much for being here and listening to our plight.

Our next category we entitle Peace Builders. From the Inland Agency I'd like for the following people to join me here at the table. Julie Johnson, the Director of Public Relations, and Fanisha Lyons, a 9-year-old participant who is a peace builder.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Now I know why she's not in school today. I was wondering why you were sitting back there.

SENATOR HUGHES: She is in a school. She's in a school right here. She's functioning as a university student by special permission of the president of this institution. It's called independent study.

MS. JULIE JOHNSON: My name is Julie Johnson. I'm Public Relations Director for Inland Agency, and we serve Riverside and San Bernardino counties and Inyo and Mono counties as well.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Four counties?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes. But we really concentrate on Riverside and San Bernardino counties.

I'd like to thank you, Senator Hughes, for allowing us the opportunity to come here and talk to you today about this most simple and innovative violence prevention program, and this is, by far, my favorite program because if anything's going to make a difference in violence I truly believe it's this program.

Last week a reporter called me terribly upset, and I talk to reporters all the time and it's very seldom that I hear one under this stress and it was quite alarming to me. He told me about the stories that he had to cover in a

matter of a couple of days. One was about an 11-month-old toddler who was shot in the head in our area as his father and brother watched on. And the day before that a mother was shot in the head while holding her baby, and that same day another baby was shot and killed. And they were all victims of unintentional -- well, they're unintentional victims of drive-by shootings.

Senators, San Bernardino County was just rated number one in violence and crimes per population. Riverside County followed as a second. Inland Agency wishes to convey...

SENATOR HUGHES: Is that in Southern California or number one, where? Number one out of, what?

MR. JOHNSON: I believed it was State of California.

So Inland Agency wishes to convey to you the sense of urgency of our violence crises in our area and we really need your help.

And with that, I would like to start the slide presentation, if maybe I could tone down the lights just a little bit.

Inland Agency has been serving Riverside and San Bernardino counties for the last 24 years. This statement is what our agency is striving to accomplish and it's so vital I'd like to read it aloud to you.

There is a need in society for a realignment of values concerning violence. Violence and violent acts are viewed as entertainment. When our awareness was raised about the consequences of drunk driving our society ceased to tolerate or be entertained by the funny drunk driver weaving through traffic. When most people began to see smoking as anti-social behavior, the number of adult smokers began to decline.

There needs to be a campaign against violence as strong as Mothers Against Drunk Driving or the public health campaign against smoking to change attitudes and values about violence, and that is what our agency is striving to accomplish.

The American Psychological Association's Commission on Violence of Youths stated last month that violence is preventable and that intervening at an early age, especially 4 to 8, before children's habits of aggression are firmly fixed, was among the Commission's main recommendations. The Commission also aimed efforts aimed at a child's family, classroom, community and the media. The report described as particularly effective programs in schools that taught social and emotional skills like managing anger, negotiating, adopting another child's perspective, and thinking of alternative solutions to disagreement. Unknowingly, the American Psychological Association was speaking about Peace Builders point by point.

SENATOR HUGHES: A question by Senator Wright.

SENATOR WRIGHT: What you're talking about, I'm just wondering, since your main thrust is in Riverside County and San Bernardino, 1983 I authored legislation that became known as the Ventura Project and both of those counties are involved with the Ventura Project, and that's for youngsters at risk and they've been involved in that program now for -- since about 1987, '88. I'm just wondering if you're aware of the program, if any of your presentation, have you ever been involved in that youngsters at risk and if you see any difference between those two counties and other counties in the State of California.

MS. JOHNSON: Well, Riverside and San Bernardino counties do not have a violence prevention program right now targeted towards the formative years, and no, I'm not aware of the Ventura counties.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Well, it's called the Ventura Project because Ventura County was used as the pilot and just picked up on that name. But it's dealing with some of the statements you just made now about violent actions of youngsters which are a signal for the future, and it's those youngsters that are addressed in this program because that's why it's called For Children At Risk. It's kind of getting to them before they have the problem. I was just wondering, in all your...

MS. JOHNSON: Well, I know Peace Builders is directed towards every child, whether they're at high risk or not, and it's more of a character building skill that will stay with them for a lifetime. And if I may continue I'll explain a little bit more.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Okay. Then yours is more involved with, as you're saying, youngsters, an education program to prevent the violence and...

MS. JOHNSON: Most definitely. This is a prevention program.

SENATOR WRIGHT: And this program is dealing with youngsters who are seen to have violent tendencies themselves and to address it.

MS. JOHNSON: Right.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Okay.

MS. JOHNSON: Peace Builders was developed by Dr. Dennis Embry, nationally recognized for his work with the Pentagon and the families during the Gulf War. Dr. Embry was also a consultant for "Sesame Street."

He used approximately 150 scientific studies to create the structure for community intervention. The core technology of the program was the result of several million dollars of federal and privately funded research.

Now, the Centers for Disease Control believes that Peace Builders could be a very effective strategy in reaching "Healthy 2000" goals for reducing violence. Because of that belief they've just awarded Dr. Embry a major

3-year grant to continue the research of proving the effectiveness of Peace Builders.

Peace Builders was successfully proven in Tucson, Arizona and Bryan, Texas in 1992 and is presently ongoing.

Now, the Peace Builders concept is quite simple. The core principles are to increase the self-direction of each student, to increase opportunities to learn and teach, to increase cognitive, emotional and social skills, and to increase positive home-school and community-school relationships.

The key point to remember here is that Peace Builders targets kindergarten through fifth grade, their formative years. The character building skills taught to them at this age will stay with them for the rest of their lives.

Peace Builders makes the world a safer place by following just four simple, basic rules. The first rule is to praise people, just because it encourages people to do more nice things for you. The second rule is to give up put-downs, because we all know that put-downs are the first step towards aggressive behavior. Rule number three is to notice and speak up about the hurts I've caused. Now, this teaches children a very difficult task: to take responsibility for their actions and their words, and this rule will have more impact being taught during their formative years than any other age group. Rule number four, find a wise adult to help you. This part of the story helps a child learn that there are many people who might be wise besides a parent. A neighbor, someone at church, an aunt. This also teaches the child another lesson: the joy of seeking wisdom.

Peace Builders first starts off with the teacher giving each child a workbook in English or Spanish to be taken home and worked with the parents. The parent and the child fill in the blanks through a story line with names of people that the child knows. Now, what makes this workbook so interesting for the parent is that each page has a note detailing what the page is trying to convey to the child such as "Adults Please Note." Children who are aggressive tend to overestimate the rewards that come from hurting others. This page is a chance to get a better understanding of what your child thinks will result from being aggressive. You see, Peace Builders is a very effective parent training device. Hands on.

In the event that the parents do not have the time or, in some cases, not the interest to work with the children, the children can work the book with older siblings, grandparents, neighbors, and perhaps even teachers. At least the children will become exposed to the four basic concepts in the rules and, in some cases, can be instrumental in implementing Peace Builders in the home.

Now, included in the workbook is a peace building chart that is often

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

placed on the refrigerator where the parents initialize or place a star next to the completed task. Some of these tasks are "I used a nice voice after hearing about a hurt I caused," or "I stopped myself from saying a put-down after somebody gave me one." Now, after all these slots are initialed, the family is entitled to a prize such as a free pizza and then a chance to win a major family vacation for the entire family, and we are shooting for sending the entire family up to Monterey Bay Aquarium for the week.

Now, at the same time the family is working Peace Builders at home, the teacher reinforces the four basic rules at school. A teacher can use Peace Builders anywhere from five minutes a day to twenty minutes a day, depending on the amount of aggression in her classroom.

By simply incorporating the vocabulary into everyday activities, a teacher can provide good, clear models of peace building such as presenting choices for children, coaching reasoning rather than lecturing, structuring the environment so that positive acts are more likely to happen, publicizing successes and assuring awards for positive actions.

Now, here are some of the ideas that teachers in Tucson, Arizona use. Another idea here that is not on the slide is from Mrs. Miller, a teacher in Arizona who stated, "The kids in my fourth grade class would say terrible things to each other and then get into fights over it. So I started asking the kids to write praise notes to each other for all the good things they do and I would place them on the walls for everybody to see. Working with this idea and the entire program, the difference was amazing. Within two weeks the aggression had slowed down so much that I was actually able to introduce new subjects into class."

The children themselves are allowed to come up with their own peace plans that address their own personal problems. One 8 year old in Tucson wrote, "My little brother used to bug me by coming into my room without asking so I made a stop light for my door. When it's green he can come in. Red, he knows he has to stay out. We both agreed that the red wouldn't always be on the door. It worked. We fight a lot less now."

Another child stated, "I wanted my family to listen to me but they kept asking me about everything else. It made me mad. They didn't listen to me at all. I decided to do something different. I asked my parents to go on separate walks with me once a week. We look at stuff and I tell them what's bothering me. They listen to me more and that's just what I wanted."

Now, the media plays a major role in Peace Builders. The children and the parents become excited and motivated about working Peace Builders through the media by featuring success stories from our local children. Radio stations

will participate by having recognizable DJ's hand out Peace Builders workbooks at schools. Now, one school in Tucson built a peace wall with the children's names written on it as a peace foundation for that school and the media loved it. They took off on it. So positive stories are possible in the media.

The business community, through paid advertising, sponsor vital messages of tips to decrease violence or such things as how to talk to an angry young person on TV and the radio airwaves.

Now, all the components I've just mentioned -- the family working together, the school reinforcement, media stories and the business/community messages -- are coordinated simultaneously throughout Riverside and San Bernardino counties for the most dramatic and effective impact. The Peace Builders kickoff is scheduled for March 1994 and will continue for three months.

Now, as you can see by the pie chart, it takes an equal investment from the family, the school, the community and the media if we are going to make a start in decreasing violence permanently in our culture. You know, there's 1,001 reasons why violence occurs. It's just not the family structure, it's just not the economy, and it's just not the TV set; but yet, it's society on the whole that must come together to prevent and finally control the violence in our communities. It's everyone's responsibility to say no more to violence and to take an active role in preventing it, and this is another reason why I like this program so much. Because it gives people back the power by becoming involved. Peace Builders is a vital community intervention.

So how much does a program like this cost? Well, for the price of a McDonald's Happy Meal, or, shall we say, $2.25 per child, a child will gain life-long tools that will encourage him or her to be a responsible member of society. Now, when you consider the price of incarceration of one prisoner for one year, the cost of cleaning graffiti and the medical costs incurred by gunshot wounds, it is apparent that violence prevention is the least expensive and the most effective route to go.

Senators, Peace Builders is what you would call a very sound business investment.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Excuse me. What's the grade levels?

MS. JOHNSON: K through 5 but we actually have had funding for preschool and the book is being adapted for preschool and for after-school programs.

SENATOR WRIGHT: And another question. You said English and Spanish. What about the other languages?

MS. JOHNSON: Well, this is the first round for English and Spanish and we are looking into the possibilities for others.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Because especially in California we have such a variety of

languages.

MS. JOHNSON: I agree with you.

So far we've been fortunate to have the PTA's and civic organizations fund this program for the schools because the schools, of course, do not have the funds to pay. Unfortunately, PTA's are foregoing other worthwhile projects to fund this program. This means that a lot of the time the proposed field trips for kids or special literature has been placed on hold. There are many schools that do not have active PTA's and therefore they are often the ones that need Peace Builders the most and they are also left out.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Excuse me. Could I ask you one more question?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes ma'am.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Have you thought of the possibility, since I notice that one of the four component parts there is community, of going to these service clubs making this kind of a presentation, say, before Rotary or Kiwanis, those organizations that do community work to support or adopt a school for this reason?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes, we have, and they have, I'm proud to say, they are adopting schools as well as the PTA's. Everybody is coming together and it's just wonderful. But there are still some areas in our county that do not have access to civic organizations or PTA's and so those schools are being left out.

It is Inland Agency's goal to have 303,000 children in Riverside and San Bernardino counties be exposed to Peace Builders within the next three years, and our agency would also like to be instrumental in bringing Peace Builders to all the children in California.

We have a chance here to make our two-county area a less violent place for many future generations with this simple and inexpensive program. We can give this little boy the tools he needs to lead a productive, nonviolent way of life that will reduce aggression, increase positive relationships, and improve academic success. With Peace Builders we can make the world a safer place.

And that's it as far as the slides are concerned, but there are a couple of other points that I'd like to bring out.

The program will give tools to aggressive children to learn how to deflect their anger and teach them to take responsibility for their actions, but this program, even more importantly, will give tools for the nonaggressive kids on how to deflect other children's anger and how to deal with their own feelings of powerlessness. This program is for all children.

One of the problems I have had is that the principals and even some teachers are very overwhelmed with other programs right now. Because of this, it's taking a longer period of time to gain their attention and even commitment

to do the program. Although I'm not recommending mandating this program, it would certainly help if the state could provide incentives for schools and communities to commit to working violence prevention programs.

And finally, before I introduce our special guest here, I would strongly like to urge the Senators that it is time to put our money on prevention measures that especially focus on violence prevention for the formative years that include parent training. San Bernardino and Riverside counties are in need of funding to fill in the gaps that PTA's and civic organizations cannot fill. State money would be very helpful in partnership with businesses to provide paid advertisements to get the airwaves saturated with anti-violence tips and other messages on the four basic rules.

Please help us to put down violence forever in our state.

And I would like to introduce a very special friend, Miss Fanisha Lyons. Fanisha experienced working Peace Builders firsthand and she's in a better position to tell you what she thought about it.

MISS FANISHA LYONS: Good morning. My name is Fanisha Lyons. I'm 9 years old and I live in a housing complex in San Bernardino where there is a lot of violence.

My dream of peace would be to live in a place where there are no drunks walking around, no men yelling at each other, no drive-by shootings and no killings. I want to live in a place that I can play with my friends out in the opening and not be so afraid at night when I go to sleep.

Last summer the kids in the complex started working Peace Builders during the Watotahenie(sp.?) program, which means judging of royalty. We all took the Peace Builders workbook home to work it with our parents. My parents and my sisters and I all worked the Peace Builders booklet together.

My sister, who is five, was always getting me in trouble with my mom. She would tell my mom I did things I didn't really do. When we started the Peace Builders I told my sister I would stop yelling at her and like her a lot better if she would tell my mom the truth. It took a while but she started to do it because my mom promised she wouldn't raise her voice when we admitted we did something wrong. The house is a lot quieter now and I actually say things to my sister nicer now.

At school there were a lot of mean kids. Sometimes they do things that scare me. If I just look at them the wrong way they will get mad. I wish I could have more peace at school. I wish the kids would get along better. When the kids get in fights the teachers get in a bad mood. Then no one is happy.

There's a lot of talk about guns and drugs. When I go to church they tell me not to mess with drugs or mess with guns, but yet at school everyone talks

about using them.

With Peace Builders I learned how fun it will be to make people feel good about the nice things they do. I also learned that if I will stop calling other kids names they will like me more. Even though I don't like to tell people what I do wrong, I found out people will trust me more if I am honest and speak about what I do.

I wonder what it would be like to live in a world without violence. Will you help me find out? Will you help me build peace? Will you sign the peace pledge for me? And the peace pledge says, "As a grownup living near," and you put where you live, "I pledge to help the children in California build peace. I will seek wise people for advice and friends, praise people, give up put-downs, notice and speak about hurts I've caused. I will make sure every kindergarten through fifth grade child in California get their own violence prevention program. That way each child can help build peace in school, at home and in communities. I pledge to encourage each child to be at peace. I pledge to encourage each grownup to be at peace, too." Then you can sign your name.

Thank you.

SENATOR HUGHES: Fanisha, I really, really appreciate your being with us today, because you give us some real insight into how we can solve this problem.

I heard you say something about sometimes the kids get angry with you because you look at them the wrong way. Do you know there is a mother sitting in our audience today who lost her son? Her son was shot because another boy said that he looked at him the wrong way. How do you correct that? How do you make sure that you're not guilty of looking at someone wrong way? I don't smile a lot. A lot of people have smiley faces. That's nice. Do you smile a lot? How do you correct your behavior so that people don't think that you're looking at them the wrong way?

MISS LYONS: Well, if I look at them the wrong way they will make an angry face at me, but then I will go over and I will tell them I'm not trying to look at them the wrong way. I don't know which way they want me to look at them anyways.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Would you look at me the wrong way?

MISS LYONS: No.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I want to see what it looks like. Do you know what it is when you're saying you look in the wrong way? Could you look at me the wrong way?

MISS LYONS: I don't know which way I am looking at you that make me look

at you wrong. (Laughter.)

SENATOR HUGHES: How have you tried to correct that? Have you gone around with a smile on your face more often or have you just gone around and talked to people first before they misinterpret how you look?

MISS LYONS: No, I will just go around looking my regular way. I wouldn't look any face at anyone.

SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. Because I think that's a really difficult thing. You know, you brought up something that got another young man into trouble. Looking at someone the wrong way. And I'm sure if they accused you of looking at them the wrong way you didn't really intend to do it. Is that right?

MISS LYONS: No. I didn't really intend to do it. I don't know which way they want me to look at them. They just...

SENATOR HUGHES: Didn't like the way you looked, right?

MISS LYONS: Yeah.

SENATOR HUGHES: So you may not like the way they look either, right?

MISS LYONS: Right.

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, thank you so much for sharing with us today, and I know that you did not play hooky. You just went to college before you finished elementary school. Thank you.

Any other questions? Yes, Senator Hart.

SENATOR GARY HART: Could I ask about the funding for the program?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes sir.

SENATOR HART: You mentioned something about the cost of the program was a minimal amount.

MS. JOHNSON: Yeah, $2.25 per child.

SENATOR HART: And what does that money buy, again?

MS. JOHNSON: It buys a workbook, it buys teachers. This is the little workbook that's sent home to work with the parents. But it includes the teachers' manuals, videos, peace posters and then a workshop by Dr. Embry. He comes out and he teaches the teachers for about four hours on the ideas and the principles behind it to get them going.

SENATOR HART: And the funding for it now, you said, comes entirely from PTA's...

MS. JOHNSON: PTA's and civic organizations.

SENATOR HART: And your testimony was that there are many schools in San Bernardino and Riverside counties that do not have PTA's?

MS. JOHNSON: That's correct. Well, they do have PTA's but, unfortunately, they're not active in fundraising, so they're unable to get funding. So we just work twice as hard but we do not have an actual grant or anything to

provide this as of yet.

SENATOR HART: And how long has the program been in existence?

MS. JOHNSON: We are just kicking it off in March. Fanisha tried it. We tried it with her program, Watotahenie(?), at this housing complex, but it was proven in Tucson, Arizona and Bryan, Texas. So we're bringing it from there.

SENATOR HART: So you're going to start it this spring?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes sir.

SENATOR HART: And how many schools are going to start it in the spring?

MS. JOHNSON: Well, we're looking at close to 100,000 students. We're anticipating that for this March, and hopefully within three years we'll get the entire two-county area which will be about 303,000.

SENATOR HART: And there's a commitment in the program that if you participate you have to spend, if I heard you correctly, five to twenty minutes a day on this program?

MS. JOHNSON: Well, just by incorporating it into the vocabulary teacher can work the program such like there's two children fighting in the lunch line. Instead of the teacher walking up and lecturing them, she would simply ask them, "Now, how would a Peace Builder behave in this instance?" So it's getting them to think about their actions, and it's more of a creative. So in that way it's just by incorporating that that the teacher can work the program. It's simply reinforced in school. It's really worked at the home. It's a parent training.

SENATOR HUGHES: Yes, Senator Wright.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I heard you right, you expect to have 100,000 youngsters involved?

MS. JOHNSON: That's what we're hoping for.

SENATOR WRIGHT: And there's 300,000 youngsters you're saying between the two counties?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

SENATOR WRIGHT: So you're trying to just kick the program off with at least a third of the school population, or at least the K through 5 involvement.

MS. JOHNSON: Yes. And like I said, we do have preschools coming along.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Is that preschools within the public school system or the private?

MS. JOHNSON: Private and public.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Because I think it would be difficult for -- even if the state wanted to go 100 percent across, it would be difficult for the state to get involved in private. But I think I'd rather see it, at this point in time,

just evolve within the public school system.

MS. JOHNSON: Well, it's a great program. I just love it.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Thank you very much, both of you, for coming and sharing with us today.

Our next program that we're going to hear about is used by the acronym W.A.R.N. (Weapons Are Removed Now). Jay Shaffer, Cabinet Director, would you come up, please, to the table? And Robert Kladifko, the Principal, and Debbie Carlos, a student at Reseda High School.

DR. ROBERT KLADIFKO: Senator Wright, Senator Hart and Senator Hughes, I'm Bob Kladifko, Principal of Reseda High School. Thank you for the opportunity to be here to talk about some of the positive programs that the students and staff at Reseda High School have started and have nurtured along since February 22nd of this year when a tragedy occurred at our school that we're still having a very difficult time in overcoming.

This November 8th issue of the U.S. News and World Report told us that 3 million crimes a year are committed on public school campuses. The University of Michigan report indicated that 9 percent of eighth graders carry a gun, a knife or a club to school at least once a month. Grade ten, 10 percent; grade twelve, 6 percent.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Is that statewide?

DR. KLADIFKO: The nation, Senator Wright.

Researchers at Cincinnati's Xavier University interviewed principals in 1,216 school districts throughout the nation, and those principals said in urban districts that violence has increased by 64 percent. In suburban districts the principals said that violence had increased by 54 percent. And in rural districts they said that violence had increased by 43 percent.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Excuse me. Were you here when the first gentleman made the presentation -- Mr. Dear -- in regards to the credentialing -- he's a consultant with the Credentialing Commission -- but of that task force where they had gone into schools and questioned...

MR. KLADIFKO: No, I was not, Senator Wright.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I wish you had been here, maybe you could have responded to it, for the simple reason that according to the survey they were working on, no one admitted there was any violence, and yet you're giving outstanding percentages.

DR. KLADIFKO: This is reported in the November 8th issue of U.S. News and World Report. It is not a very comfortable report for us in public education. But I'm here to tell you that the students and the staff at our school have done some things that I would like to share with you today. In fact, one of

the main programs is our W.A.R.N. program. "Weapons Are Removed Now." Dr. Jay Shaffer, the sponsor of the Student Cabinet, has brought three students and I'd like to introduce him and the four students that will tell you a little bit about that program and show you what we're doing at the local schools around Reseda High.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Before you go on, prior to the incidents in your school where this young man's life was lost, would you have considered your school a violent school?

DR. KLADIFKO: No, we would not. In fact, it was very common knowledge that we perhaps had the safest school in the district, and I think that's what's most devastating to us and to the public that if something like that can occur at Reseda High School then it can occur anywhere in the nation at any school, private or public.

SENATOR HUGHES: So that you would say that any school is a potentially violent school.

DR. KLADIFKO: Yes ma'am.

SENATOR HUGHES: Just because of the numbers of students and numbers of people that you have in a confined space.

DR. KLADIFKO: Senator, the schools are a manifestation of the community. We live in violent communities and it's not just restricted to urban centers. The violent communities are all over, including rural communities. And I'm sure that you have read many statistics as well as I have about what is occurring in our communities. And the school is not an island, it is part of our community.

Dr. Shaffer.

DR. JAY SHAFFER: Thank you for this opportunity to address you. I'd like to tell you just a little bit about my part in W.A.R.N.

After the shooting that Dr. Kladifko referred to, I reflected upon what I, a teacher of 28 years -- 14 years at Dorsey High School and now 14 years at Reseda High School -- what I might do, and I thought that if I could organize some students and we could change some attitudes that maybe this might be a direction.

The initial response to all of the violence in the schools is get those metal detectors in. More, more, more metal detectors, locker searches, weapon searches, and with the proliferation of weapons these are admirable goals, although I wonder sometimes about the practicality of being able to metal detect successfully 2,000 to 3,000 students every single day, considering chain link fences -- the caliber of weapon that was used in the shooting at our school was so small it could have been slipped through any one of thousands of

holes in a chain link fence and buried -- and I thought, What are we going to do for the elementary school student today and the middle school student today so by the time he reaches high school he wouldn't want to bring a weapon to school, he wouldn't think that if somebody had a weapon in school that it was a right thing to think of him as a friend. So the focus of W.A.R.N. was to change the attitude of the young.

I met with the Student Cabinet and we mutually decided that maybe the message should be carried by students rather than teachers. It's one thing for teachers and parents to constantly talk to their children, it might be another thing for older students acting as somewhat surrogate brothers and sisters, big brother, big sister to go into the schools. And that's what this program did.

Our attempt is to create a W.A.R.N. chapter in every school in the district and then hopefully every school in the state and nation. And the concept is very simple. This high school would be responsible for their neighborhood schools. Maybe the six elementary schools or four that feed the high school, the two or three middle schools that feed the high school and that's who they would take care of. They would make contacts to those schools and ask for permission to visit the schools and come in and make this program on a constant basis similar to what D.A.R.E. did concerning drugs. Because we knew if we tried to reach one school reach thousands of elementary schools it would be physically impossible, but if everyone would adopt their own little cluster we perhaps could do it.

The focus of the program is for the students to, on their own -- there is no pre-prepared text. The students who join the W.A.R.N. club at Reseda High School, we meet every week. They prepare a skit, a rap, a personal anecdote, something that they feel is relevant to go into the elementary schools and share with them, and we want to go back more than once in the year. Last year when we kicked this off in March, between March and June we visited Welby Way Elementary School, which is in Woodland Hills, Shirley Avenue Elementary in Reseda, Encino Elementary in Encino, Main Street Elementary in Los Angeles, and Portola Middle School and Mulholland Middle School, which are in the West San Fernando Valley. We're hoping to repeat visits to those schools this year.

With me today are four students who have been an integral part of the W.A.R.N. program. Our current president of the W.A.R.N. program is Debbie Carlos, who's sitting on my right. And along with her we have Yvonne Dahkeel(sp.?), Danielle Schneider and Jamie Rebeck over here and we're hoping, if we have time, they would like to present to you a W.A.R.N. skit that they did for Welby Way Elementary School. This is a skit geared for fourth graders. It would take about twelve minutes or so to do. But I'd like to turn the mike

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

over to Debbie.

SENATOR HUGHES: We have a question from Senator Wright and then one from myself and then we'll hear from Debbie.

SENATOR WRIGHT: One of the things that we seem to see is that drugs and violence and weapons go hand in hand. With all the emphasis on D.A.R.E. programs trying desperately to reduce the use of drugs, in your 28 years of teaching -- and let's take this school because this is where you organized W.A.R.N. and this is where you had violence take place -- have you, in the 14 years, seen a rise, a peak, and maybe a decline in the use of drugs or any relationship to drugs at the school?

DR. SHAFFER: Well, from a personal observance, I think I've seen a decline in terms of at least in the school as I've observed it. Of course, since drug use is underhanded to begin with, it's hard to tell. You see, something like this program and something like the D.A.R.E. program, I wonder if you can ever really measure the total success of it. Because the statistics are always kept of the people who are on drugs, the people who possess guns, the people who have the handguns. I don't know that anybody has been able to compile statistics of those people who thought about it, got exposed to a program and decided not to do it. You know, it's like keeping statistics of planes that land safely. You know, we're always going to report the crashes.

So from a very limited perspective would say, to me, it looks like it's not as bad as it was maybe in the '70s and early '80s, but this is a very myopic and microscopic opinion.

I wanted to add just one thing. This program, so far now, has -- inquiries have reached as far as Birmingham, Alabama and a suburb of Houston, Texas. So we have been getting some calls from people nationwide involving this as well.

SENATOR HART: Senator Wright, let me just comment if I could, and to the witnesses, my understanding of the data, the self-report data, if you ask students their use of drugs, which is maybe not totally accurate but I think it's probably the best indicator as long as you guarantee anonymity, there clearly is a decline in casual drug use among most people. For example, the use of marijuana. The problem is is with crack cocaine and some of the much more debilitating drugs among a certain group of students or young people, there has been some significant incline.

And so one of the debates, when we talk about D.A.R.E. and if we have limited money for drug education, one of the issues that the Analyst raised is that we ought to give some consideration to targeting whatever drug education money we have to those populations that are most at risk in terms of issues

like crack cocaine. And there are a whole series of indicators that you can take a look at, particularly as it relates to parents and whether or not there's been violence in the home, whether or not there's unemployment, divorce. A whole series of indicators. And when all of those sort of come together you know that you have a kid that you probably ought to be targeting those efforts towards.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. This is a question to either the teacher or the principal. Do you still have lockers in your school, and how frequently do you have locker searches, and have you ever contemplated doing away with lockers? Because I've recently been in a couple of schools where they've just done away with lockers. Since your incidence, what do you do about locker searches?

And then the other question I want you to answer, if possible, if you have metal detectors do you plan on having them? Are you for them or against them?

DR. KLADIFKO: We do metal detecting searching daily on a random basis. This includes searching students and lockers and this is done daily, randomly.

SENATOR HUGHES: This is just since the incident.

DR. KLADIFKO: Yes. We had metal detectors prior to the incident. We used them for extra-curricular activities. For example, entering our football stadium or entering a dance. Since the tragedy we are and most schools -- in fact, all of the secondary schools in Los Angeles are mandated to use the metal detectors, using the hand-held.

SENATOR HUGHES: Describe them. What are they like?

DR. KLADIFKO: It's a hand-held metal detector.

SENATOR HUGHES: It's a hand detector that when you buzz off going through airport security then they use it on your body.

DR. KLADIFKO: That's right.

SENATOR HUGHES: You mean to tell me you actually do that to each student coming in to the school?

DR. KLADIFKO: It's a random selection. For example, we have all of our classrooms in a fish bowl and we pull out a two-week schedule, and then we would visit the classroom and select from the teacher's roll the first, third, fifth, seventh, so on student and they would be searched then in a private area out of the classroom.

SENATOR HUGHES: You mean you go in the classroom and you say, Gary and Shirley or John, you come with me?

DR. KLADIFKO: Yes ma'am.

SENATOR HUGHES: Isn't that kind of insulting to a student? I mean, I'd be upset if my child came home and said to me, "They keep pulling me out; no

matter what class I go to, they keep pulling me out," and then I'd begin to wonder if the school was just picking on my child. How do you handle that?

DR. KLADIFKO: Before we started the program we sent a letter to all of our parents. We also brought the issue up with our Community Advisory Council and our Student Cabinet representing the students. As we continue the program I continually ask parents and ask students, "Do you favor this program? Do you think we should continue it?" And they come back and tell me day in and day out, "You must continue it." In fact, we could ask Debbie how she feels or if she has ever been searched and get her reaction.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right, Debbie, why don't we start with that question and then you can go on to your presentation.

MISS DEBBIE CARLOS: Well, as far as your question goes, they don't necessarily point out the students. They'll just call out the names. They might not even know the students or even look at their appearance. You might go into an honors class and you'll have clean-cut kids and they'll just pick out the numbers and they'll take them into separate rooms. I have been searched and I don't consider it insulting. I mean, I have to be searched along with anybody else. If it's going to stop the problem or at least curb the problem, I agree with it.

SENATOR HUGHES: Most of your fellow students don't feel offended by it?

MISS CARLOS: Most of them don't because they feel that if it's going to make them safer or at least take a step towards making school safer then they're all for it.

SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. Any questions from Members?

All right, now would you tell us about W.A.R.N.?

MISS CARLOS: Well, Dr. Shaffer pretty much summed it up, except that as far as the schools, we do gear our performances to the age groups and when we go we kind of let the children know that they can confide in us and that it's okay to trust adults and that weapons are in no way necessary to settle disputes. The main reason why we go is -- our motto is "Break the Code of Silence." And that is, in effect, if a child or anyone else sees a weapon or knows of someone that is carrying a weapon that they let someone else know about it before it's too late, and that is the main point of our program.

SENATOR HUGHES: How are you encouraged to let someone else know about it? Aren't students threatened sometimes or feel apprehensive that if they've seen someone else with the weapon -- it's like being a witness to a crime. Witnesses are often reluctant to come forth. Is there any anonymity or any security provided to you, or do you know? If you go and you tell the principal, you tell your guidance counselor, your classroom teacher, your

homeroom teacher, are you assured that you're going to be okay or will someone finger you for fingering them?

MISS CARLOS: Well, we pretty much tell them that it's okay to tell, it's up to them to go and tell. I think it's the responsibility of whoever they tell to keep it anonymous, and I think they would do that just to provide for the child's safety.

DR. KLADIFKO: Senator, you are aware that we have an anonymous telephone number that we use throughout the district and advertise on signs in classrooms and on the perimeter of our campus, and anyone -- student or a neighbor or anyone -- can call that number and it is kept very confidential. We have received calls at our school but we have not retrieved any weapon through that method, but we have received calls.

DR. SHAFFER: Senator, if I could respond. This is one of my biggest concerns is the anonymity because I know in order for this thing to work a student has to feel safe if they tell. And one of the suggestions that I've made, and I really so far don't think I've gotten very far with it, is that there either be a citywide, districtwide or a statewide mandated program to basically train school administrators and campus police officers in a uniform procedure of anonymity so that one school isn't saying, well, you come in this room, and another school is doing something else. I know when the mandate came down for the metal detectors the first thing that happened, every administrator in the district was -- correct me if I'm wrong, Dr. Kladifko -- was taken for a one or a two day training period on how to use the metal detector, how to assure the anonymity you were talking about before that somebody wouldn't be picked on.

So I would like to see this done for this program. If we're going to encourage people to tip, then we should have a set program to guarantee anonymity and everybody should be doing it the same way, and maybe that's something that could be done legislatively. I don't know on that.

SENATOR HUGHES: Yes, Senator Hart.

SENATOR HART: Could I ask, Dr. Kladifko. You mentioned that you have this hotline number and calls have been made to the hotline number but you haven't uncovered any weapons.

DR. KLADIFKO: None at my particular school.

SENATOR HART: Okay. How does it work then? Someone calls and -- I mean, as a typical case they call and say, you know, John Smith has a weapon, and then what happens? Do you investigate that and how do you go about making that investigation?

DR. KLADIFKO: The call goes to our district office. It's a 24-hour

situation where someone is there and they've been trained in how to handle it. Then the call will come to me with as much information as that person has been able to get from the caller -- I have received calls at my home as well as at school -- and then it's up to us at the school to follow up.

I can recall one incident where it was a prank and we found that out because the person that was identified was someone that just in no way would be carrying a weapon and got very emotional about it. But we still had to follow up on the call. We do it private, confidential, but we follow up using the metal detector and using all of our counseling and inquiry type of methods that we have.

SENATOR HART: How many calls have you received at your school?

DR. KLADIFKO: At Reseda High I think we've received about five since last February(?).

SENATOR HART: But no weapons have been recovered and no disciplinary action has been taken against any of the students who were "fingered"?

DR. KLADIFKO: No, no action at all.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Excuse me, just to follow up on that. You get the call and then do you do -- can you include that youngster in the random...?

DR. KLADIFKO: It's not random. We have to be very careful...

SENATOR WRIGHT: In other words, what I'm saying, you get a call and you're going to be going through -- doing just random detecting process or going through lockers, as you say you do random. Can you just include that in or do you have to try and do that separate?

DR. KLADIFKO: No. We would handle that person individually. We have been monitored, the district has, by the Office of Civil Rights and we've been working with them very closely to protect the rights of our students. So we would not be able to include that individual in a usual random selection because then we would be selecting that person.

SENATOR HART: I had one other question I wanted to ask Debbie. I was struck by the program, as you described, that it seemed oriented to all of the other schools, to the younger children. What is the program, or is there one at Reseda High School for Reseda High School students?

MISS CARLOS: Well, the students at Reseda High School already know about our program and we expect them to already know this. I mean, what we're doing is we're trying to stop the problem at the root. So we might not be able to help the high school students because the administrators and such are helping them. We're geared at helping the elementary and junior high, or middle school students deal with this in their own way because we can't very well make up skits for our own students or classmates or peers because they might not look

at us at the same level maybe middle school children or elementary school children might look at us.

SENATOR HART: That strikes me as -- it doesn't quite ring true. Dr. Shaffer's comments were it ought to be a student-run program that would have the most impact, but then you're saying we can't have the impact with our own students, we have to go to a lower level. I thought that under the drunk driving and some of the other programs there really was an effort at the high school level for students to be involved in helping other students at that level.

DR. KLADIFKO: We have some other programs, Senator Hart, at our school that we feel are taking the place of that. When the program W.A.R.N. kicked off we did do a presentation that involved all of the students signing a code of silence banner. But we also have many lessons that our teachers teach that are just like what the youngsters are doing at the other schools and our teachers have been trained to teach these lessons. And when they get into their presentation it'll be just like what our staff will be doing.

SENATOR HART: One last question I had for the student, for Debbie. When you read in the newspaper about incidents of violence and guns on campus, one of the comments that's made over and over again by students is, well, the reason why I have a weapon is for self-protection. If I don't carry a weapon I'm going to be at risk. Do you hear that? Is that overstated? And if it's not, how do you and your associates in W.A.R.N. deal with that concern that if everyone else has a weapon then I need to have one as well?

MISS CARLOS: I think it's highly overstated, just like drugs. Not everyone is using them. So it's a very highly overstated statement.

SENATOR HART: Do you think in a lot of instances when people are caught with a weapon that that's just a convenient excuse and is not really what's going on?

MISS CARLOS: May be. It could be.

DR. SHAFFER: Would we have time for them to do their skit?

SENATOR HUGHES: All right, let's see the students.

(STUDENT SKIT PRESENTATION)

SENATOR HUGHES: One question I had as I watched you, at what point do teachers advise counselors...(inaudible)?

DR. KLADIFKO: Well, when we visit a school, the school has a lead notice that we're coming and we meet with the individual teacher in which class we're visiting as well as the administrator of the school and brief them on our

program and what we're going to be doing at the school. So there is some dialogue between us and the administrators and the teacher at each school before we do this.

DR. SHAFFER: Also, Senator Hughes, one of the ways the students get transported to the elementary schools is very often one of our administrators or dean might drive them and stay in the classroom while the presentation is being made. So between the teacher of the elementary school class who is there and one of our own personnel, there's usually someone there to answer some questions that the students may not be able to.

DR. KLADIFKO: Senators, in addition to this I'd just like to briefly mention some other things that occur at Reseda High School that we feel contribute towards the safety and security of the school.

We have an ongoing peer counseling program that's actually a class that's offered. We have a procedure and a plan of action for handling disturbances, disorders or demonstrations. It's current because we continue to update it. We have a dress code that is constantly being revised and is currently being revised and we will provide a copy to you of that. It concentrates on gang attire, eliminating gang attire and/or paraphernalia or gang related symbols from our campus. For example, in the dress code one of the items on here is no hats at any time on the Reseda High School campus. This is because we are told and we are aware that hats with certain symbols can be gang attire. So the staff and students and parents have outlawed that at Reseda High School. No belt buckles with initials or extra long belts. You might think that some of this is being overly cautious but in order to help us establish this current dress code, two officers from the L.A.P.D. Jeopardy Program visited our committee and they showed us some of the gang attire and symbols that are being worn now.

Neighborhood Watch Program that we have at Reseda High that involves the local residents and the police department. An expulsion policy that our board has adopted mandating expulsion for weapons and look-alike weapons on our campuses, and police arrest. We have a school bus safety program that was started this year involving a videotape and a discussion with all students that ride buses to help keep them safe.

At Reseda High School and other campuses we have a closed campus. At our school we happen to have a perimeter fence and there is only one entrance to the campus and that is monitored by a campus security aide.

So there are many things that are going on to help us in our school.

Last, but not least, Dr. Shaffer talked about a way that you could help us in regards to the tip program and the anonymity. Other ways would be to help

us in establishing legislation against violence on campus. We followed 14 bills, with your assistance, Senator, and out of the 14 that we followed, 9 were signed into law or enacted by the Governor and we were very happy to see that.

Please help us find ways that we can regulate violence as our students see it in the movies and on television and in publications. Shortly after the tragedy at our school I left the board of education and in a pile of magazines right outside the front door to the education building was a magazine in Spanish depicting a local movie star in a local hit with an Uzi in his arms.

It's things like this, Senators, that influence our young people to be violent, and I think we need to work together, not only legislators but parents and administrators and students and community leaders, to find the ways that we can regulate the violence that we're seeing on television, in the movies and in our magazines.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Could I ask you one question on that, because certainly when I was growing up -- and there's a big gap between then and now, I have to tell you -- but we saw violence in the movies and we saw violence in the newspaper reports and you had stories you'd listen to on the radio that were violence and we didn't seem to -- you know, it was just that. It was a story, it was something we saw in the movies, but it didn't seem to have that much effect on us. So what's the difference that seeing it today has such an effect on our young people?

DR. KLADIFKO: Well, I think that the times have changed, at least since I was young. I think what we're seeing now in the movies is much more realistic and on television than it was in past years. It's much more realistic.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I don't know, was it James Cagney? I mean, he was a real bad guy.

DR. KLADIFKO: Not what we're seeing now.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Half of these kids probably don't even know who he was.

Do you think it's a possibility that years ago there was the good guy and the bad guy and the good guy always won and the bad guy always got punished, and today I don't think maybe the stories carry that. I think what you see now is the bad guy is glorified.

DR. KLADIFKO: I think that's part of it, yes.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I can't believe that we can't -- you know, on the one hand we say freedom of expression -- art, what is the difference -- the art forms, what we can do on the one hand -- we should have freedom of expression. And then on the other hand we have to curtail that because our young people are so impressionable? And I don't know how to put my finger on it but there's

something here that is contrary. There's a conflict between what makes us a country so great and that you have the freedoms as compared to our constantly trying to curtail those freedoms because we are affecting young people, because they just can't seem to see the difference between good and bad?

DR. KLADIFKO: Well, I think that times have changed, as I've indicated before, and I think that you're right about the bad guy perhaps being glorified more than it was in the past. But I think my main point is that what is out there is influencing our young people and there's so much of it in so many ways, many more ways than we had in earlier years. It's just something that we've got to work on together in a cooperative effort to regulate these and I know it's difficult. But I think that's something that will make an inroad in preventing violence in our neighborhoods and our schools.

SENATOR WRIGHT: It seems to me the cowboys years ago could get at least twelve rounds off of a single shotgun without any problem and nobody paid any attention to it.

SENATOR HUGHES: But they were only watching that when they went to the movies or when they watched TV. Now it's all the time.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Well, I guess it's just a breakdown, I see, in the family because, again, you can set rules and regulations within your home of what a child can watch and cannot watch.

SENATOR HUGHES: I think that we said early on in the testimony that one of our main problems was the dysfunctional family, not families that we knew of historically. Whether it was a single parent family or a two parent family it was still a sense of family and the sense of family extended outside of your own household, that your neighbors watched you and you watched their children and everybody seemed to care. Now everybody seems to mind their own business which is really bad.

SENATOR WRIGHT: When they should care.

SENATOR HUGHES: Yeah, when they should care.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Maybe Vice President Quail was just ahead of his time.

SENATOR HUGHES: When he talked about other people's business? (Laughter.)

SENATOR WRIGHT: No, when he talked about family values.

SENATOR HUGHES: Oh, okay.

DR. SHAFFER: One of the things, Senator Wright, that I've observed is in the days when you were talking about movies and such maybe the "cowboy" had a six-gun in the movie but it didn't mean that in the common everyday household that six-gun was also prevalent and displayed. Today, the weapons of power that are displayed in the movies are just manifestations of what many of those weapons are on the street. And I think as long as we have this tremendous

proliferation of weapons and we have an entertainment industry that seems to be more interested in the good old capitalist tradition of making a buck, then trying to create entertainment to change attitudes we're going to be in trouble. I mean, I think it's give the kids what they want rather than mold into perhaps what we as adults -- I mean, after all, that is the role of an adult is to help a child develop a good set of values. And I think now we're almost letting the child determine the value for the adult to put on the television and to put on in the movies.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Then we as adults are responsible.

DR. SHAFFER: I think we do bear responsibility.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I think we have to draw the line here between what is legal weapons and illegal weapons, and I don't think that you could curtail legal weapons and still not have a proliferation of illegal weapons. I don't think that you can talk about, again, the freedoms because anyone who wants to write a story, wants to produce that either as a play or a motion picture has a right to do that and we don't seem to take our right of not going to see it. There's a lot of movies that I wouldn't go see and I don't care if it gets an academy award.

DR. SHAFFER: I think one of the questions to ask is what do we do as a society, other than boycott, to convince those who would make such movies to change the direction of their movie making? You know, that's, I think, one of the things that is an ongoing process.

SENATOR WRIGHT: It's a battle. I can write a story but you don't have to read it. Except if it's a story of my life and then I want you to buy the book.

DR. KLADIFKO: Thank you for the opportunity to talk about our program.

SENATOR HUGHES: I forbid my children from reading that garbage. (Laughter.) No, I'm just joking.

All right. I thank all of you. We're going to break for lunch now and the persons who testified today, anyone testifying would they approach me, and I want to tell you, there will be some luncheon for you in the Solis(?) Room for anyone testifying today. Right now.

(LUNCH BREAK)

SENATOR HUGHES: I would like for the next two witnesses to come up to the table now. First, we want to hear from Sandy Cooney and then Darwin Farrar.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Could I just ask you a question, Madam Chair? We were to have some audience participation from this morning?

SENATOR HUGHES: Yes, I know, but I think we'll just have the audience participation at the end, period.

"Straight Talk About Risks." It's called the STAR program and Sandy Cooney is the Director of Western Regional Operations, and Sandy, in your presentation, tell us how your program is funded and what areas it covers.

MR. SANDY COONEY: Our program is primarily funded through grants, but what I'd like to do this afternoon, if I may, is read from prepared text, or if you prefer we can just go to questions you might have about the program.

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, what will make you feel comfortable?

MR. COONEY: Well, I have to be honest with you. I am recently appointed to this position and I come from New Jersey in working with Governor Jim Florio. Previous to that I worked with Governor Tom Kane and my personal experience with this program has been its implementation in New Jersey. I had a hand in working with the Governor's office in the Department of Education in implementing the program in 21 middle schools throughout the state. Currently, the program is here in California and in Los Angeles and in the Los Angeles County schools.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. How long has the program been here in California?

MR. COONEY: Well, it began in Oakland several years ago. It is in the San Diego schools, and in Los Angeles I believe it was begun about a year-and-a-half ago.

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, I think you'd do us more good by just telling us -- did you work with this program in New Jersey?

MR. COONEY: I worked on the implementation in New Jersey. My prepared text pretty much goes through the curriculum; outlining the curriculum for the various grade levels and talks, to an extent, about the funding for a typical program in a municipal area. But I just thought, in the interest of time, it might be better that -- I mean, I can deliver it directly.

SENATOR HUGHES: No, I think it would be better, in the interest of time, rather than -- we can take that as part of the testimony, if you wanted us to, but, you know, you could tell us how successful it was when you worked with it in New Jersey and what kinds of obstacles and handicaps you think that we might encounter here in our state and particularly in this locality. Of course, you don't know that much about this locality. But we just appreciate your experience and your sharing that with us.

MR. COONEY: Certainly, Senator.

It's no secret, and I'm sure you're well aware of it, that the greatest obstacle these days to any sort of additional program that you're bringing to

the schools is going to be funding. Funding is difficult to come by no matter what. For the most part, in all cases where this program has been implemented, funding is a problem to a varying degree, depending upon where implementation occurs.

Another very important aspect to consider is resource and teacher availability. Teachers in this day and age are so overburdened because of class size and delivery of basic curriculum that even if you have the funding and you attempt to implement a new type of program like the STAR curriculum, it's difficult. As a teacher I may say, Look, what am I going to do? I have these problems but I have a mandate to deliver basic core requirements to these students regardless of the grade levels.

So what we have done is designed this program so that it is flexible. It can be taught in any subject area in any series of units. The units run about an hour but are flexible depending upon the grade level. Certainly for second graders we're not going to try to pin them down for an hour. It runs about twenty minutes and involves roll play and dealing with emotions and, again, can be used in health curriculum or in visual and performing arts, in any sort of curriculum to be built into that school day. Some schools do it over a several week consistent period where they'll do health curriculum for an hour a day for fifteen days. In other words, three weeks. Other schools spread it out over an entire semester. So, again, flexibility, we have found, is really important in trying to see that the curriculum be delivered.

As far as I'm concerned, I think two of the most difficult problems are funding and flexibility. Teacher time.

SENATOR HUGHES: Question from Senator Wright.

SENATOR WRIGHT: This morning we had Inland Agency here in regards to youngsters in their Peace Builders and they basically narrowed it down to about $2.25 per student cost. And so you're saying in this particular program, if you want to implement the program, it's a case of the dollars. What would it be? Can you break it down to a cost per student type situation?

MR. COONEY: That's a good question and it's a question that I would ask, too. I'm not prepared today to get as specific as per student cost. But I can tell you that in Los Angeles the center has raised more than $200,000 from private foundations and individuals for delivery of the program to more than 50,000 students. A typical 24-month program for a municipal school district serving 15,000 students costs between $40,000 and $60,000 for all materials and services.

SENATOR WRIGHT: So it's $40,000 to $60,000 for approximately 50,000 students?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MR. COONEY: Fifteen thousand students over a 24-month program.

SENATOR WRIGHT: All right, then, if you could explain to me -- did you hear the presentation this morning?

MR. COONEY: No, I did not, Senator. I arrived only forty minutes ago.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Okay. If you could just detail exactly what is included in that program for that forty or sixty thousand dollars, because it would seem to me -- they were talking about $2.25 per student in the program that went from kindergarten to fifth grade. They're starting in the Riverside and San Bernardino counties where they have roughly 300,000 students and they would be dealing with 100,000 students in this initial program. So that's like one-third of the students. So your program seems to be exceptionally costly because I'm going to compare between the two. So what do we get for the forty to sixty thousand?

MR. COONEY: I would caution you, Senator, in an analysis like that simply because the programs, in comparing them you need to look at what each program is and exactly what is being delivered to students.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I appreciate that because the one thing I'd be concerned about is that we have a problem so we're going to address this and we have 9,000 different programs and they're all implemented in all the schools and it's just dollars chasing dollars and nothing being accomplished.

MR. COONEY: Certainly, Senator.

SENATOR HART: I just want to interrupt and say at $40,000 and 15,000 students, that's $3.00 a child. That's not exceptionally expensive.

MR. COONEY: Well, again...

SENATOR HART: If you have thirty kids in a class and you spend $3.00, it's $100 if that's what it takes to be effective.

MR. COONEY: Again, I think this is going off on a tangent debating cost when it -- what you first need to do is analyze what the program is purported to deliver regardless of which program it is. Once you understand that and its implementation then, of course, you've got to determine results through evaluation.

Again, I can only comment on our program because, unfortunately, I didn't have the benefit of hearing about the Peace program.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I'm sorry you didn't.

MR. COONEY: Yeah, I wish I would have. And in fact, in picking up your pamphlet today I see quite a few programs in there and you alluded to the fact that there are all these curriculums all over the place. How do we know as legislators which one's going to do what or how do we know as school officials or parents or municipal officials what the outcome is going to be and the

benefit for students?

Educators will tell you that that is one of their biggest problems. I know in education departments around the country, many of them do not sanction curriculums simply because there are so many of them. They will endorse them but they will not come out and say, I as the commissioner of education am putting my stamp of approval on this.

Having said that, I can tell you about our program, and I think there might be somebody in the audience who can speak from a firsthand perspective. But our program first goes into the schools by offering training sessions to the teachers. In other words, there's an overview for teachers and administrators of just what the program entails for the various grade levels and how we expect that program to be delivered. Again, we stress flexibility but we take it right from the beginning where we go to the teachers and administrators who then take it to the students. Once it is delivered to the students, and we're pretty confident that this is one of the most effective aspects of this program, is the evaluation. Knowing from those students and administrators after the program has been implemented just what they're getting out of it.

But to go back to your previous question about costs, I can't, at this stage of the game, break it down specifically per student. Part of the reason is because it varies depending upon where that curriculum is being delivered. So it's a soup to nuts kind of thing where we're there at every stage of the game with the schools, with the teachers and administrators.

I know in New Jersey STAR was implemented about eighteen months ago and we go back on a consistent basis to various districts to follow up on what's happening with that program to do in-services with teachers and to evaluate how students are benefiting from the program.

SENATOR WRIGHT: So what does the program do?

MR. COONEY: The program is designed to encourage children primarily to seek methods for resolving conflict in a nonviolent fashion. While it speaks to the issue of gun violence -- and as I understand it, here in the State of California for people under age 19, for youngsters younger than 19 years of age, gun death has become the number one cause of death and surpass motor vehicle accidents. So it does have that component where it speaks to the issue of gun violence. But more important, it talks about resolving conflict in a nonviolent fashion and does that on each grade level where appropriate, dealing with role playing, emotions, how to channel anger, things of that nature.

SENATOR HUGHES: Could you tell us, in the State of New Jersey what gun laws did you have that you're aware of that we don't have in California?

MR. COONEY: Well, I know from personal experience that our assault weapons

ban is similar to California's and a little more strict. It seems from -- and bear with me because I'm new to this game -- but it seems from the research that I've done on my own in trying to learn about what's happened here in California with respect to legislation that you, in fact, do have some of the strongest laws in the country and, apparently, many of them. New Jersey has some pretty strict laws, and it's interesting, I don't know what goes on here in California but it seems as though New Jersey frequently compares itself to this state.

SENATOR WRIGHT: They lose on that comparison.

MR. COONEY: Well, Senator, I respectfully differ with you.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Then you haven't oriented yourself to California.

MR. COONEY: Well, I haven't given you all the details. I actually grew up in Newport Beach, but anybody that knows Newport Beach these days knows well that it is not the same as it was a decade or longer ago. And for that reason actually I left. So it's been a while since I've been back here and, quite frankly, I'm suffering culture shock.

SENATOR HUGHES: What? What? Being back as a New Jerseyite?

MR. COONEY: Well, yeah. That has presented some problems of its own.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Stick with us. We're a good team here. We'll take care of you.

MR. COONEY: With respect, Senator, though, to the laws, I believe, from what I've been able to pick up so far, that California's got some of the strongest laws in the country and, in fact, surpasses New Jersey when it comes to that.

SENATOR HUGHES: But our problem is still terrific in schools.

MR. COONEY: You know, this has come up a lot in the last month as well. I think people are like, you know, what's with all these laws, what are they going to do? We are the proponents of the Brady Bill and every day for the last couple of weeks when Brady was up in the House and now in the Senate people were like, oh, come on, what's the Brady Bill going to do? What's it going to do for California? We already have a waiting period. All these laws, laws, laws.

Well, I can tell you that I know what it's going to do for California. It's going to keep guns from coming into this state from areas where there are no waiting periods because that's what we saw in New Jersey. New Jersey doesn't have a waiting period but they've got...

SENATOR WRIGHT: Excuse me. Do you really believe that?

MR. COONEY: Absolutely, Senator.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Every time a crime is committed, I would invite you to

contradict the fact that it's done by an illegal weapon. Either they stole it, either they purchased it somewhere out of the back end of a car; however they got the item. Because as far as guns are concerned, the law abiding citizens, they'll go with the waiting period; they'll do everything they're supposed to do, but you're still not going to stop the violence with guns.

MR. COONEY: We don't advocate that what we're talking about with respect to legislation and so called gun control is any sort of panacea. Anybody knows, regardless of which side of the aisle you're on, that what is going to solve these problems is going to be a comprehensive solution, something that brings into consideration laws which are far more reasonable with respect to gun control while at the same time advocates a curriculum that addresses the issue of violence in children.

I had the opportunity while in New Jersey to work on the Drug Free Schools Program, which essentially, at the heart, says that we are able to solve this problem if we go to the generation that has yet to come of age and influence them to change the future. We may very well not be able to do anything about a lot of what's going on among 18-, 19- and 20-year-olds, but it is a sad commentary if we begin to believe that we can't do something with children in the schools. And what that's going to take is a comprehensive solution that involves many different approaches collectively to deal with the problem. And one of those is a more reasonable attitude towards the way in which we use and abuse firearms.

SENATOR HUGHES: What is so unique about the STAR program? We have all these various programs that are being presented to us today and every day as people go around and try to sell programs that cost more money. What we are basically looking for is a program that really works. What did you find out about the STAR program that you think is really good for us eradicating this problem?

MR. COONEY: Unique is a great question, Senator.

SENATOR HUGHES: What's the uniqueness of it?

MR. COONEY: And certainly there is another question that I would probably ask if our roles were reversed when you've got to deal with all these curriculums coming up again, and again, and again.

In answer to that question I would say the way you determine how unique a program is is by listening to the response of children that were able to benefit from that program. I mean, certainly you have to make some decisions before that program's implemented as to which one you're going to pick. But our experience has been that children are actually learning what is taught to them through this curriculum and have expressed that in these evaluations.

My feeling is that what sets this curriculum apart has a lot to do with peer attitudes, conflict resolution, and the method by which that is presented. I think in examining the curriculum you'll find that there is a difference between how STAR is implemented and delivered as opposed to other curriculums.

But I will stop short of going any further because I really am not expert enough and would be more than happy to put you in touch with people in our organization who are who can explain to you in greater detail why, in fact, this program is unique from others.

SENATOR HUGHES: You start at pre-K. What do you do in a pre-K curriculum that we don't already do?

MR. COONEY: Well, we use Dr. Seuss. There's a book, and I mentioned this in the prepared copy of which you all have a copy, to talk about -- are you speaking, Senator, specifically to pre-kindergarten or the spectrum...

SENATOR HUGHES: Yes. Because in the discussion Senator Wright and I both agreed that we're waiting too late for these preventative type programs. We were saying yes, we should get at pre-K. What do you do that we don't already do? Maybe I shouldn't be that specific.

MR. COONEY: Well, no. You're entitled to be as specific as you'd like. My only disadvantage is that I wish in my answers I could be equally specific in giving you what you need.

Clearly, at that age -- and I believe we're talking about 4 year olds, 3 and 4 year olds, in fact. I mean, pre-K takes you all the way back. But from an academic definition we're talking about 3 and 4 year olds. If I'm not mistaken, the way it works is through role play. We talk to children and give them examples and allow them to interact with each other to deal with anger and to resolve that anger acceptably.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Well, I'm even going to help you. I'm going to turn to page 5 of this yea thick book that you passed out, and it says -- "Pre-K to Second Grade" -- that materials you use is the "Butter Battle Book" by Dr. Seuss. That's where the yooks and the zooks battle over whether buttering bread on the up side is better than buttering the bread on the down side.

Now, what is the difference -- I'm sorry you weren't here -- but what would be the difference in what they do here, where they send a little booklet home with the youngster to deal with their parents in which they have little questions and answers and little things that they have to do between the childrer and their parents? And they get kind of brownie points, I guess what you would call it.

MR. COONEY: Sure. Well, I can tell you what the difference is not even having benefited from the program delivered earlier this morning. Again, I'm

speaking without having -- and I really dread doing this -- but without having the reference of what was discussed this morning but...

SENATOR WRIGHT: Well, that's fine, but just tell me how...

MR. COONEY: Well, the idea that you're sending something home with the child to interact with their parent, right there leads me to ask questions. Part of the problem is in the home! I mean, we're talking here about the potential that maybe that child doesn't have a parent that gives them the attention they need.

SENATOR WRIGHT: So how does this help?

MR. COONEY: It's in the school. We interact with the family but the curriculum itself is delivered in the classroom and the interaction goes on in the classroom. I believe what you mentioned with respect to what was presented this morning, it sounds like something that's sent home with the student unsupervised.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I wouldn't say that, no, because the teachers interact, too. But I think the parents are brought into the circle, and I guess I should have been more specific when I was talking to you, is because this seems to be all school centralized, just at a quick glance, where this was family included. And I don't want us going off on a tangent where the schools take over for the parents.

MR. COONEY: No. No. And we don't advocate that at all, although as you well know, there are those situations where schools have become sort of the last bastion for students to be free from harm because of what goes on in their homes. The curriculum does have components within it that allows for parent-student interaction and teacher-parent-student interaction.

But again, to go back to your initial question, I would be somewhat skeptical about letting a young child take something home only out of fear that that would not be dealt with at home because there's so many other things going on in families today given the dysfunctional nature of many of them.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Maybe we should just carry legislation to outlaw dysfunctional families.

MR. COONEY: Well, boy, we'd all be sitting on a very small island, I think, if that were the case.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Yeah, we would. Certainly would. I'm being facetious when I say it and I hope you appreciate that.

MR. COONEY: No, absolutely, Senator.

SENATOR HUGHES: Should pre-kindergartners be aware of guns? Should you teach them about dangers of guns?

MR. COONEY: Yes.

SENATOR HUGHES: You don't?

MR. COONEY: No, no, no. Absolutely, we do. We teach them about not touching guns. Students at that age are taught about the dangers of guns, solely from the perspective of not touching them because of their being dangerous. We don't get into the reality of what happens when guns are abused. It's strictly a, Don't touch this, it's not for you to touch. It's a dangerous thing and if you see any of your playmates touching it they're to put it down and stay away.

SENATOR HUGHES: Do you discourage them for having guns as play toys or do the children come and tell you that yes, we have a water pistol at home, which a lot of little children receive just by going to birthday parties and they have these little prize packages and they get a water pistol in the prize package. What do you tell them to do? Not to touch it, to throw it away? Do you say that we should make a whole lesson around this water pistol? What do you do, or do you not mention it? I just want to know because it's a reality that guns are in their environment whether they see it on TV, whether they're going through a picture book and they see a picture of a gun in a magazine. Because yours is really pointed at gun violence. So when do you introduce guns into the conversation, how do you introduce them, or do you wait until it just happens?

MR. COONEY: No, absolutely not. I mean, waiting is probably the worst thing you could do in any sort of -- whenever you're trying to educate kids. I mean, to hide information from them when they become aware of it is clearly counterproductive and we don't advocate that.

In the early stages, again, guns are discussed as a danger and there's no discussion of anything other than that, that they are to be not touched and left alone.

With respect to the question you ask about water pistols, clearly children need to be taught, and again, I beg your indulgence, but taught about the difference between the real gun and the toy gun. Typically at that age they are where they're going to be receiving these guns as toys or what have you. There is an ability on their part to understand the difference, and if I'm not mistaken that's what's presented within the curriculum. Differentiating. Again, not avoiding the issue of guns at all at any stage of the game. I think avoidance is, again, counterproductive.

SENATOR HUGHES: Why should a school district want to adopt a program like yours? What is it going to guarantee to them better than any other? If you were the sales person for this program what could you say are the projective outcomes, at what point in time, and does it work everywhere? You said it

worked in New Jersey. I read here that it worked in Dade County. You say they're going to be trying it in Los Angeles and in Oakland and other places. What's your biggest selling point about this curriculum as opposed to any other? Besides the fact you have a whole lot of materials and stuff for teachers to read.

MR. COONEY: Right. First of all, if I were selling the program, there are no guarantees. Maybe part of the reason that I'm here with this organization and not a salesman is because I always kind of lay that out up front and most salesmen aren't necessarily going to tell you that. They'll tell you that hey, this is guaranteed, it's the greatest thing going, it's going to work for you. You know, it's got your name written all over it.

With respect to this curriculum, the only thing that I can say that is its greatest selling point is that it has been demonstrated to work. We have analysis and evaluation in areas where it has been implemented to show that children, students, respond to it positively. That they have learned the precepts that are set out in the curriculum, absorbed them and have attained a certain level of understanding with respect to guns and gun violence and, more importantly, nonviolent conflict resolution.

If it were me and I were a school district looking for a curriculum, and Lord only knows, again, there's so many of them out there, two things I would do. I would look at their data and their analysis to see where it had worked and how well it had worked in those places. And the second thing I would do would be to talk to areas and schools where the program has been implemented to solicit opinion as to what they thought directly. I'd pick up the phone and call them. I think in presenting a case for his curriculum that's what I would say to you, if you were school administrators or teachers, that look, here's our data, here's our statistics. We can show you on paper that it works but we can also tell you who you can talk to if you want to pick up the phone and ask.

I wouldn't advocate that something like this would work everywhere because I just don't know that. Wherever we go and however this is implemented, it's done on a case-by-case basis and so far we've had pretty outstanding results and a high rate of acceptance on the part of teachers, administrators and, most importantly, students.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I haven't read line by line, page by page, but just going through the "Pre-K to Second Grade" section of your book here, I don't see anything that I would say would require a curriculum in the schools. In other words, we would have to purchase the information you have to offer in order to present it at school? I see some things that teachers, depending on the area, because every place up and down the State of California is different, I would

see where teachers and parents and the administration of the schools could pretty much do some of these things in regards to youngsters without having the curriculum.

For example, when you talk about safe places, I know there's a lot of areas, especially in my area in Simi Valley, where they used to have block captains that were involved with the schools and parents that were going to be home all day, mom and dad didn't both work, would have a little sign in their window. It was a place that if a youngster, if there was an emergency or a problem they could run in there and talk to the lady. Things such as this that could be implemented without this curriculum.

MR. COONEY: It's a tremendous idea, Senator. I mean, if that's the case, then we should be out there doing it. This curriculum was set up through a lot of research and design. I mean, as far as I know, those that designed this curriculum may very well have taken from some of those things that already exist and combine them into this. I have no objection with that. I mean, if those things are already going on and can be expanded upon and brought into the schools to solve the problem, that's fantastic. But this is something that we present that brings all that together in the form of a curriculum.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I guess what my concern is that I -- again, I'm not trying to be critical but it's my first glance at it -- I see it's a Center to Prevent Handgun Violence, and it looks like it started out in Washington, D.C., which tells me it was probably a government study, then created the Center, and I can imagine the dollars that was spent to get to this point, and this curriculum.

MR. COONEY: Well, no. That's not the case at all.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I just wonder, so if you can give me just a little bit of background.

MR. COONEY: Sure. I can give you background on the organization so you know where this is coming from, and, in fact, for reference you can look at the copy that I've included with the curriculum.

Handgun Control, Inc. was established in 1974 to act as a lobbying arm for gun control legislation in the nation's capitol in Washington. The Brady Bill. I mean, eventually what they've been doing has come to be known, at least for the last six-and-a-half years, as the Brady Bill. And what was an outgrowth of that in, I believe, 1983 was the Center to Prevent Handgun Violence, which acts as an educational arm to the organization, has the curriculum as part of its component, and a division we call Entertainment Resources that works with the creative community to more accurately portray violence on television and in film.

But we are a nonpartisan organization. This organization is committed to

doing what we believe is the right thing in proposing legislation for reasonable restraint on handgun abuse. It's a sad commentary to me personally that we as a country have waited six-and-a-half years for one of the weakest pieces of legislation on the planet. A 5-day waiting period is certainly not an inconvenience when, in most states, you have to wait longer than that without a waiting period.

SENATOR WRIGHT: It didn't start out as that, though, did it?

MR. COONEY: No, I think it started -- well, Senator, I don't have to tell you about the legislative process. Somebody recently referred to the bill itself as "a tattered prom queen" who, you know, six-and-a-half years later showed up disheveled at best. But it started out, I believe, with a much longer waiting period, but to the nature of what goes on not only in Washington but, as you're all well aware, in Sacramento, things change and what you see today is not what it began as six-and-a-half years ago.

But again, if we as a country were anywhere close to what the State of California has been with respect to some of its laws, or New Jersey, for that matter, we'd be a lot better off. We're not out to ban handguns. We're not out to take people's guns away. What we're out to do is propose legislation that we believe, when combined with other things, is going to reduce violence in our society.

SENATOR WRIGHT: So the STAR program is just a spin-off of anti-gun legislation.

MR. COONEY: Well, again, I wouldn't characterize it as a spin-off. What STAR is is a curriculum that was designed for the specific purpose of teaching children about gun violence, and again, more importantly, about conflict resolution in a nonviolent manner.

SENATOR WRIGHT: And then this booklet, or a book that you have here, which is the curriculum, as you call it, I notice that it would appear that basically if a school wanted to try it would have to go through you and go through the costs, because it says right here, "All right reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by means--electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise--without prior permission of the Center."

MR. COONEY: Senator, it's copyrighted. This is the United States of America. I'll tell you, the proliferation of lawyers in this country...

SENATOR WRIGHT: Excuse me. If I wanted to rush out and give this to my principal at school I couldn't do it.

MR. COONEY: It's against the law, Senator.

SENATOR WRIGHT: That's right.

MR. COONEY: But I don't know, maybe for you we could make an exception. There isn't anything that you would do like this, whether it be a curriculum or anything else, that you're going to put your name to and invest time and energy that I wouldn't say copyright. I mean, there's too many people out there who live off taking other people's ideas, and for that reason it is copyrighted.

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, we appreciate your sharing this information with us and we'd be glad to share it with anyone who is interested in it and we'll look at it and see if our staff can come up with any uniqueness of this program as compared to some of the others that we've looked at, and I appreciate your sharing this with us.

MR. COONEY: If I may, Senator.

SENATOR HUGHES: Anything else you want to say about it?

MR. COONEY: Sure. One of the things that I am very concerned with, and I know I speak for the organization when I say this, is that we have reached a point in this country and in this state when it is incumbent upon us as citizens and incumbent upon the legislature that we've elected to implement, to bring forth legislation to allow to be implemented a curriculum in the schools that addresses violence, or a multitude of curriculums. We've got to start doing something that creates a mandate that says here is how we, as a society, are going to deal with this problem in the schools. I mean, I'm not entirely sure what the outcome of these hearings are going to be but I would hope that what ultimately happens is that legislation is put forth that deals with the issue of trying to get to that generation that has of yet come of age to influence them through some sort of coordinated effort on school safety and on violence.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right, thank you very much.

MR. COONEY: Thank you very much.

SENATOR HUGHES: Next witness is Darwin Farrar, Director of Policy, Pacific Center for Violence Prevention, California Wellness Foundation.

MR. DARWIN FARRAR: Thank you. At the outset I'd like to thank you, of course, for inviting me but, more importantly, I'd like to thank you for holding these hearings. I think that the attention you've given the issue and, to be candid, the scrutiny you've given the people testifying before you speaks very well of your interest and commitment to the issue. So, again, thank you.

As you stated, and for the record, I am Darwin Farrar, the Director of Policy for the Pacific Center for Violence Prevention. The Pacific Center is the resource and policymaking body for the California Wellness Foundation's Violence Prevention Initiative.

You may be aware in the booklet which you've provided, it states that the California Wellness Foundation's Initiative is funding several community groups to work in violence prevention. To be more specific, there are 18 community groups funded, each group being a coalition. The smallest one being, I believe, three organizations, community organizations. The largest one being approximately 300 community organizations. These 18 groups are distributed fairly evenly throughout the state, throughout Northern and Southern California, and they touch the major suburban, urban and rural areas -- Fresno, Modesto, Los Angeles, San Francisco. They're pretty much all represented there.

In addition to the community groups that we fund, we also fund about eight academic researchers coming from most of the major academic centers in the state, approximately twelve community fellows and academic fellows working in coordination with the Centers for Disease Control, as well as other community groups, and we also fund an evaluation team, utilizing researchers from Stanford, Johns Hopkins, and the Rand Institute, to evaluate the various components of the Initiative.

With that introduction, I hope I've made clear, and I will clearly state now, that unlike a lot of people who come before you -- I wonder sometimes if I'm in the right room -- but unlike a lot of people who come before you, I don't have a program to sell you. I'm not buying a program either, just in case anybody out there wanted to know.

The community groups -- well, let me backtrack.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Name them. Give us an example. Just take the smallest group that you talked about where you have three or four community groups. What are the community groups that get involved?

MR. FARRAR: The community groups -- it's a question I can't clearly answer. I could give you some names if you wanted, but more importantly...

SENATOR WRIGHT: Some idea of -- you know, is it Kiwanis, is it Rotary or is it PTA?

MR. FARRAR: In San Francisco, which is where I'm located and I'm most familiar with, we fund the community group RAP, which is really a coalition of several groups. RAP stands for Real Alternatives Program. That's the largest of the coalitions. Again, our community groups basically consist of the whole gauntlet. We have groups that are working with police entities, we have people who are working with schools, we have people who are working with the Kiwanis, we have people who are working with hospitals.

SENATOR WRIGHT: So it's not just education.

MR. FARRAR: No, it is not just education. And in point of fact, as I was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

going to state, it is our belief that violence in the schools is an artifact of violence in our communities at large. Schools have previously been something of a safe haven and I think they now represent the overflow of violence and it has finally reached that point.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. So then what do you do specifically with schools? Say you're talking about Oakland schools where they have problems, too. So what does your group do with community groups that might form in Oakland to address the problem that we're addressing here today on school violence? What would your foundation do with these identifiable groups? They've already identified themselves and come together, or do you identify them and bring them together? And once they're together, what do you do for them?

MR. FARRAR: I think the Oakland schools is a good example. I recently taught there myself on a volunteer basis, and yes, they do have a problem. In a six-week course I lost two students to gunshots.

In terms of what we do, we don't bring the community groups together. They form, they apply for grants themselves. So that was their first act of cohesion in forming a unit. It is our belief that solutions to violence -- the problem of violence is very varied. The solutions to violence are going to have to come from those who live with it, from the communities. It is probably not the most popular thing to say in this meeting; however, it is our belief that there is no single solution or single program which is going to effectively eliminate violence in our schools or in our communities. So what do the community groups do?

The community group's first task, in this the initial year, is to come together to work with the people in their community, including the schools, including the police, to formulate a plan to address violence in their communities. Some of the community groups are doing conflict mediation. Others are doing mentoring. Some are working more directly with the schools, some are working outside the schools with school personnel to do adult education, for example.

SENATOR HUGHES: So, in steps, where does the California Wellness Foundation come in? Do they have to apply to you for a grant to do the things that they want to do? What do you do for them? What do you do for anybody that wants help from you? What do you do?

MR. FARRAR: The community groups apply for a one-year planning grant to come up with a solution to the problem. In two months they will submit their final plans as to how they're going to address the problem. Provided that the proposal that they submit is do-able -- i.e., they're not going to try to feed

5,000 people with a loaf of bread -- provided it is do-able it will be funded.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Where do you get your money?

MR. FARRAR: California Wellness Foundation gets its money from what was Health Net. They were a private HMO that went public as a result of the tax laws. When they went public they had to disgorge themselves of certain funds. Those funds were used to fund the Wellness Foundation.

SENATOR HUGHES: And you also do teenage pregnancy stuff, too, don't you?

MR. FARRAR: We do a wealth of things.

SENATOR HUGHES: Yeah, I know it. Because I've been working on that issue, too. All right, so you're really saying that anybody in any of the school districts across the state that has a problem with school violence and can come up with a proposal that needs funding on a short-term basis, that you could handle it?

MR. FARRAR: I wish I could say that. We originally planned on funding 12 groups -- 12 coalitions. Because other nonprofits joined in, other funding organizations joined in, we were able to fund 18. We, a foundation, do not have the resources to fund it. Every program that we would like to fund, every program that's out there to address violence, we don't have the resources.

What we do have the resources to do is to fund a variety of programs, to give them enough money to try to address the problems, and most importantly, to document the results of their efforts.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. How many programs have you funded thus far that address themselves to school violence here in our state?

MR. FARRAR: Specifically and singularly school violence?

SENATOR HUGHES: Yes.

MR. FARRAR: Singularly, none. All of our programs address the broader aspects of violence in the community. Yes, most of our programs include schools and school violence. But we don't have a program which is solely limited to schools. One of our programs -- I can't remember which one, I'm sorry -- does have the schools as one of the three groups that make up the coalition, or the school in the neighborhood as one of the three groups.

SENATOR HUGHES: So that any school that would identify themselves as having a very severe school violence program and the community, or community groups in and around that school could get together and come to your foundation for funding to try to solve the program, the kind of thing that Reseda says that they do when they work with their feeder schools, and they certainly have to work in conjunction with their communities, could then come to the Wellness Foundation. And what kind of grants do you give? Short-term grants, a year, three, four months, or what, and then what happens after that?

MR. FARRAR: The idea that anybody can come is correct, except for the fact that the grant cycle ended already. So they could have come. Several did. We had numerous applications.

SENATOR HUGHES: When does the grant cycle begin and when does it end?

MR. FARRAR: It is a 5-year grant cycle. It began last year, so we are now coming up on year two of the 5-year grant cycle.

SENATOR HUGHES: So that none of these groups that we heard here today which began could come to you for funding until that five years are up. Right?

SENATOR WRIGHT: They would have to be community based where these are all school based.

MR. FARRAR: They would have to form a coalition that involve community members.

SENATOR HUGHES: With the community.

MR. FARRAR: Yes, they could, and in point of fact, the Wellness funds other projects. I work specifically on their Violence Prevention Initiative. So there may be other things out there that Wellness would be willing to fund. I can't speak to that.

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, it's just good sort of having that information to let people know as they come together to try to do something about these situations.

Any message that you'd like to leave to this committee or suggestions for what we might do legislatively to help us solve this problem?

MR. FARRAR: Yes. Actually, I have four particular points. The first one, it's one that I'm sure everybody in here would say and you would love to do, which is, very simply, to fund violence prevention efforts. There've been some unique and novel ideas about how to do that such as -- and I guess recently in the federal government is was proposed that an ammunition tax be put on bullets. The feds may do that. That's an idea.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Tax...?

MR. FARRAR: Yeah. The "T" word, I'm sorry.

SENATOR HUGHES: "T" can also mean terrific, Cathie.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Yeah. Taxes are terrific.

MR. FARRAR: Alternately, I think you might examine the possibility of transfer fees for firearm sales. Fees for firearm sales have not been changed in the last several decades and I think they're ripe for changing that. You might also look at licensing fees. Currently, it costs approximately $15 to get a license to sell firearms in California. There are, at this point, far more licensed firearm dealers than there are gas stations. That is a wealth of money at $10 to sell that the state could be recovering. And the reality is,

as numerous people here would probably tell you, of the many homicides that occur in California, estimates range from 66 to 80 percent being caused by firearms.

SENATOR WRIGHT: And they all pay the taxes in order to get the firearms, I'm sure.

MR. FARRAR: I wish. Don't you wish.

My second solution, and hear me on this one. Be tough on crime but not on children, and this is not to say you should not be tough on children that commit crimes. However, the simply reality is, currently in the State of California we have 12 percent of the children in the nation, yet we incarcerate 29 percent of the children in the nation. Children who are committed to the CYA for crimes...

SENATOR WRIGHT: Excuse me. Give me that percentage again.

MR. FARRAR: The state maintains 12 percent of the nation in the children are in the State of California. Of all the children locked up in the nation, 29 percent are in California.

SENATOR WRIGHT: You don't have a breakdown in age group.

MR. FARRAR: I can get you one. I don't have one.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I think the violence, what you'd see would be the teen and not what we think of children. I don't know, when I think of children I think of the little ones.

MR. FARRAR: You want an age breakdown. There are age breakdowns available but I do not have one with me currently.

Also, for crimes that are committed by children, for just about all of the major crimes, the top five to ten most popular crimes, if you will, an adult that commits the exact same crime is going to do less time than a child that is put in a juvenile detention facility.

Currently, California spends in excess of $30,000 per child, per year to incarcerate its kids. Other states -- Massachusetts being the example, and that's sad that somebody else is setting the example in this arena -- spend far less, far less. Massachusetts spends about $9,000 per child. California, the CYA has a 63 percent recidivist rate, which means 63 percent of those kids are going to come back. Massachusetts, which spends less, has a 23 percent. California has three options for kids: They can be given home probation, supervised probation, or they can be sent to the CYA, which includes some prison camps or some juvenile camps, as they call them. Massachusetts has 16 options. The most expensive option in Massachusetts costs more than the CYA. Because there are so many other options, the overall cost is significantly less than California. If you want to know how to save money, if

you want to know where do you get money to fund prevention, there it is.

My next solution, my next recommendation. Help communities in their efforts to work in violence prevention, and this one's a somewhat technical one. I think we need to -- you as a body outside of your committee -- need to revisit the issue of pre-emption in firearms. There are a lot of communities that would like to specifically tailor their firearm laws to the specific and unique problems in their communities but they're unable to because the Legislature has occupied the field of licensing and manufacture.

The same applies, to a lesser extent, in the area of alcohol. We have talked and heard testimony at length about the role of drugs and the war on drugs and drugs and violence. It hasn't been stated previously about the profound role that alcohol plays in violence. Drugs such as crack cocaine, such as heroin, they are narcotics. They tend to have a relaxing sedative effect. Most of the violence that is associated with those drugs is the result of small groups of people fighting turf wars; business people, if you will, doing their business. Alcohol, in contrast, has a disinhibiting effect. There has been research that documents the relation of alcohol to violence. If you reduce alcohol consumption you reduce violence. Communities' ability to regulate alcohol distribution and sales is rapidly being threatened and eroded by the alcohol and beverage industry in their lobbying efforts.

My final solution. In the schools, which is clearly the providence and the best effort for your committee, don't forget the kids that are over twelve. Don't forget the kids that are over fourteen. The sad truth is that rarely do kids who are in trouble, kids who are most prone to violence look at you and I as role models. They tend to look at their peers, people who are just above them in age. We cannot expect children to be behave, to be uniformly nonviolent, passive, etc., when their peers immediately above them are living the life, as they say, when they're setting a negative role model. We need to influence those people as well.

There is a lot of talk about zero tolerance policy. I would like to see a zero expulsion policy. Rather than expelling kids and having them be out of school, kids who don't necessarily care, particularly in light of the fact that being a drop-out from school has been documented to be one of the factors which contributes to violence, I think what we need to do is come up with real alternatives to get kids who are having problems in school and creating problems in school into some sort of education program where they'll still have to go to school. So that when they wake up, if they wake up, they actually have some real skills that they can do something with their life with.

And lastly, again, this is one that I think you can push both as citizens

and as our elected officials. I think we need to encourage business to jump into this field. Schools need to work with business if only to learn what they need to be trained for as well as to help them get funding, as well as to help get students summers jobs.

And I think that's probably enough for now. Thank you.

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, thank you very much. Those were very specific recommendations that we certainly appreciate. Made a lot of good sense.

Any other questions from Members? If not, let's move on to our next two witnesses before we take public testimony. Irene Cooper-Basch, Community Board Program; and Daria Waetjen, Program Coordinator with PROJECT YES!

All right, tell us what the Community Board Program is.

MS. IRENE COOPER-BASCH: Thank you, Madam Chair, Senator. I have a few remarks and then I also have a short video that I would like to show you that helps describe our program.

My name is Irene Cooper-Basch. I am the Director of Development and Communication with the Community Board Program in San Francisco.

The Community Board Program is a nonprofit, conflict resolution organization which was established in 1976 through the dedicated efforts of volunteer mediators. The Community Board Program has been offering free dispute resolution services to residents in San Francisco for the past 17 years. The guiding principles of our program are to prevent violence in the community, repair and strengthen relationships, provide accessible alternatives to the traditional justice system, place responsibility for resolving a problem back into the neighborhood where the dispute took place, and provide for opportunities for civic participation.

Through the years Community Board has helped thousands of people reach peaceful and lasting solutions for all types of disputes. Problems range from neighbor nuisance complaints to vandalism, threats, or money disputes, to incidents of youth violence. We also receive many referrals from schools for our community mediation program.

These services are provided free of charge to California residents and it would not be possible to provide these services were it not for the existence of the California State Dispute Resolution Act which mandates that a percentage of court filing fees be distributed to community mediation programs.

My colleagues and I would urge further legislation that allows for a small increase in court filing fees, especially for larger urban areas, so that increased funds would be available for these programs. As it is, they've been reduced by 32 percent over the last 12-month period.

SENATOR HART: What are the filing fee charges now?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: Three dollars. And there was some legislation to help increase that to as much as $8. We were trying in San Francisco to get an increase to $5 but it didn't go through.

In 1980 the Community Board Program began exploring the possibility of expanding its Neighborhood Justice Program into schools. Community Board staff worked with educators at the San Francisco Visitation Valley Elementary School to implement one of the first school based peer mediation models which is known as the Conflict Managers Program. A cadre of youth age 8 to 11 receive training in effective communication and problem solving skills, and they learn the mediation process to help their fellow students resolve disputes.

At the elementary school level, these youth would don T-shirts -- Conflict Manager T-shirts -- and they would be available at playgrounds during recess, hallways and lunchrooms. Conflict managers are on hand to help their fellow students resolve their disputes peacefully instead of resorting to name calling, fighting, or even referrals to adults.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Tell us what locations besides San Francisco. I see that PROJECT YES! is home based in Costa Mesa.

MS. COOPER-BASCH: We're home based in San Francisco but our schools program is a national program. Throughout the country there are more than 5,000 peer mediation programs. Not all of them use our model.

SENATOR HUGHES: No, I'm just asking about PROJECT YES!

MS. DARIA WAETJEN: Well, that piece is for the next piece of testimony, Senator.

SENATOR HUGHES: Oh, it is?

MS. WAETJEN: I just put it up there for your reference after her testimony.

SENATOR HUGHES: Okay, fine, thank you.

MS. COOPER-BASCH: In New York City alone there are 137 programs that use the conflict managers -- the Community Board's model.

At the middle and high school levels where the disputes are generally more serious, the process is more formal. Here the student mediators work in teams of two with those youth who have voluntarily agreed to have their problems resolved with the help of conflict managers. A mediation will be scheduled after school or during free period, and without the involvement of adults, the conflict managers would follow a basic mediation process.

First, the mediators set a positive and conciliatory tone for the meeting, building trust and helping the disputants feel comfortable. Then each disputant tells his or her side of the situation directly to the mediators. The conflict managers relate the progress to date. They might iterate where

the disputants are already in agreement. And then finally, the youths in dispute speak directly to each other. They explore possible solutions. And finally, if the participants are in agreement, a written or sometimes verbal resolution is made.

Peer mediators act as role models for effective communication and cooperation. They remain neutral and refrain from giving advice or passing judgment.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Let's get back to basics. How does the community find out about your Community Board Program and where are the programs located in our state?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: Attorney General Reno is very active in letting the country know about her strong interest in peer mediation, so that the word about conflict resolution and peer mediation is definitely gettin out in the media.

SENATOR HUGHES: Yeah, but this existed before Janet Reno took her present job, so. It's been in existence since '76.

MS. COOPER-BASCH: Right.

SENATOR HUGHES: I've never heard of Community Board Program. Maybe Senator Hart has. But tell me, how do ordinary citizens, how do ordinary teachers, how do ordinary community groups find out about your program. What happens? What are the steps? Something happens in this community. Did you outreach then to Reseda High School when you heard of the murder there? Did you outreach to Fairfax High School when you heard of the murder and the violence there? What do you do? How do you get involved in these kind of situations and how long is the timeline? What is the process?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: Former Superintendent Honig endorsed our program and developed resolutions and named the Community Board Program as a resource. So that's one way to get the information out. We do a lot of marketing...

SENATOR HUGHES: Did you come to the aid of these schools where these two children's lives were lost? Have you been involved in those schools at all or have they done their own thing with their own resources? What do you do once it hits the newspaper?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: We don't directly market to individual schools at that level. We try to make the state -- I mean, we're a resource here in San Francisco. We try to make ourselves aware in the public. We get a lot of stories in local San Francisco media press.

SENATOR HUGHES: So you're not concerned about the rest of the state?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: We're very concerned. We're very concerned about the state.

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, what do you do? I mean, how do you help the rest of the state? I'm trying to get at boom, today, Mrs. Ensley's son was killed. What do you do? You sit back and you wait for someone to come to you and say, Gee, we've read somewhere that you exist since 1976, how can we help you? Or do you aggressively go out to these communities and say, This community is a community in trouble, how can we help?

I don't really understand, and I'm trying to understand, what you do. You wait for a community to call you in and you make your services available? How do you get from incident and tragedy to the utilization of your program?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: That's a good question, Senator. We let all the schools in California know about our program by sending materials to them and if they have the resources and the interest, then yes, they would then call upon us to help them out.

It might actually be a good idea at this point just to show you the short video so we can get a clearer picture of what this program can do.

SENATOR HUGHES: You know, it concerns me because I represent several school districts and so does Senator Hart, and if we pick up the newspaper and we find out one of our school districts is in trouble -- and we've sat here today and we heard of all these different programs. I know how to access some of the others that we've heard of, and we know whether it serves that community or not. I don't know how to access your program before I even see what it's all about. That's what I want you to tell me, how I access, and then you show me what it's all about.

I'm not in San Francisco, you know. I'm in Southern California. Can I use it?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: We have people in Alaska accessing our program, you know. We have people all over the country, in Latin America.

SENATOR HUGHES: How?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: At this point, although we do some marketing, I'd say our biggest marketing is through word of mouth, through successful programs.

SENATOR HUGHES: Okay, I got your word. Then what do I do? Write to your address...

MS. COOPER-BASCH: You call our program.

SENATOR HUGHES: ...or call?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: Yes.

SENATOR HUGHES: Okay, let me see what your program is like.

(SHOWING OF VIDEO)

NARRATOR: ... who are trained to help their peers resolve disputes. The conflict manager process is now used in hundreds of schools throughout the United States. It was initiated in 1982 by the Community Board Program as a new application of its highly successful Neighborhood Conflict Resolution Program. Student conflict managers have proven that they can reduce tension and violence and thus promote safer schools and more effective learning. This tape shows conflict managers in action in elementary, middle and high schools along with responses from their teachers, administrators and other students.

NEWSCASTER: Well, conflict has been with us a long time. A grade school, however, in San Francisco has come up with a way to solve disputes among its students. A program called Conflict Managers uses students to keep peace among each other. CNN correspondent Greg Le Fevre reports on this unique experiment with playground diplomacy.

GREG LE FEVRE: This inner-city playground at San Francisco's Revere Elementary used to be one of the toughest in town. Not so anymore. Oh, there are problems. But small ones like stolen balls or not so small ones like a punch in the eye no longer bring on a whistle blowing teacher to resolve them. Now it's a fellow student trained in playground diplomacy clad in a bright orange T-shirt emblazoned with the words "Conflict Manager." These grade school negotiators are neither police nor judges but friends out to find a solution to the problem. Ten-year-old conflict manager Monica Bazurto:

"You know, we ask them if they want to solve the problem with us or the teacher."

MR. LE FEVRE: Most would rather avoid the teacher. Conflict manager Danny Cantero spells out the rules:

"Do you agree to solve the problem, tell the truth, no interrupting, no name calling?"

MR. LE FEVRE: Is there more peace on the playground now than there was before all this began?

"Oh, they used to fight."

MR. LE FEVRE: School principal Grace Novitski says conflict managers are selected by a student vote and approved by teachers. A conflict manager's physical size or popularity, she says, are secondary to good listening skills:

"Because the whole process is to be able to listen to each other's situation and to be able to keep a conversation going."

"Brian was holding Derek, then Derek called Brian a bad name. That's why Derek is crying. Derek said, 'I will watch out what I'm saying because we could get into another fight."

MR. LE FEVRE: School records show discipline problems have been cut by nearly two-thirds since the program began, and further, that Paul Revere students are less likely to cause trouble outside school as well.

"People that constantly get into fights -- not constantly but get into fights and they use the Conflict Manager system. Instead of gettin' in trouble, gettin' expelled, suspended, they go see their conflict manager and

they help solve their problems, reason it out."

"Conflict is something that is worldwide. It's not something that's unique to San Francisco or Woodrow Wilson High School. Conflict is everywhere. It's at home, it's on the buses, it's in the streets, it's in government, it's in business. It's everywhere. And that's why you're brave and courageous young people because you want to know how to deal with conflict, not only to help other people but hopefully to help yourselves."

"It's like a lot of rumors going on, a lot of jealousy going on, and it's not -- okay, you're supposed to be friends with each other but then you will go behind each other's back and you'll just chop that person up."

"Girls dog other girls. You know, you just look at them with a certain face and look and problems start like that, you know. Why can't people smile, you know."

"All _____(inaudible)_____ cool _____(inaudible)_____ and we need to help them."

"What we think about when we think about conflict is our choices are either we're going to fight it or argue it, or we're going to walk away from it. And there are other choices."

"Hi, welcome to Conflict Management. My name is Tenille." "My name is James."

"I came in and I was just rude to everybody. You know, I didn't care what nobody say, you know. I'm the new kid coming out of another school, you know, and I'm thinkin', hey, I'm in high school, stay away."

"I started because I had a conflict at school and one of my friends, you know, she helped me out with the problem I had. And I don't know, I like the way, you know, the students, our peers helped us out."

"And I came in, you know, and I saw other people, other students in a group sittin' down talkin' among each other about problems, you know, school problems and teenage problems. You know, that's their way. You know, this is something I would like to get into."

"Conflict Managers work. Our work is to welcome the disputants, to make them feel comfortable. We're trying to build trust. In the first stage, okay, we establish the ground rules."

"We have a few rules. One of them is no name calling, no interrupting. Do you both agree?" "Yeah."

"Another rule is there's no physical fighting and please speak directly to the conflict managers at first."

"You just tell them, you're going to be talking to me, looking at me, and later on, if you feel like you can talk to each other. We just tell them, you know, everything in here is confidential, just feel like you're talking to one of your friends."

"Well, you know, it's like this. I was walking outside with my friends to go meet Dakeesha. You know, we were talking about (inaudible). And so I'm walking and talking with my friends and all of a sudden I looked over my

shoulder and there goes Dakeesha hugging and cuddling up on him."

"I wasn't even cuddling all up on him."

"Oh, shut up, you know it."

"No interruptions."

"Thank you. And so I went up and I confronted her, sort of."

"What do you mean 'sort of'?"

"I asked her what, you know, what was going on?"

"__(Inaudible)__ getting out of hand. Some people, you know, might say, oh, you know, well, I'm not going to pay that any attention because, you know, they're stupid. You know, they don't know anything about me or whatever and just let that go. But a lot of people don't think like that and they, you know, want to retaliate."

"So basically you were walking with your friends, you were going to meet up with her and you look over and she's hugging on your boyfriend."

"Mm hmm."

"So how did you feel?"

"I was mad. I was disappointed in her."

"Conflict managers have to be fair and even if you see that one side maybe is more wrong or whatever, we're trying to develop a win-win atmosphere. So you have to really work hard not to become judgmental about things."

"Dakeesha, how do you feel about this? What happened, you know?

"See, okay, me and Carlos, we were sittin' outside talkin' and before he left he put his arm around me sort of like in a little hug or somethin' and he got up and left and then she just came charging on over -- 'Get your hands off my boyfriend.'"

"__(Inaudible)__ to consult with me in the middle of something, I'm available to them. That's critical. The supervision of the peer helpers is critical part of their training and it's an ongoing process."

"What I feel for a little incident like this that made us get this upset, we should try to learn how to trust each other a little bit more."

"Dakeesha, put yourself in Donna's place for a second. I mean, if you had a boyfriend and you saw Donna hugging and cuddling up with your boyfriend, would you react the same way Donna did?"

"Yeah, I would have been mad but it wasn't like that."

"Then maybe you realize how people see things in one way and somebody else sees it in another and we get to talk it out."

"As you talk to him about what their new understandings are, okay, as to how they see it now, is when you move into stage three, which is when we get

into the resolution."

"Donna, how would you prevent this if this were to rise up again?"

"Well, you know, I guess -- well, one thing, I should trust her more and not assume the worst. I mean, she is my best friend. Something like this, you know, shouldn't get in the way of that. And, you know, just act civilized, talk calmly and not just be all in her face like I was today."

"Could I just follow up then? They don't have no more problems. They either stay friends or they just, like, a hi and bye situation, but they haven't got into no fights."

"The kinds of skills that they learn, they call them themselves, these are real life skills, aren't they? They're real life skills."

"You're going to run into a lot of things, you know, and you don't think. Well, hey, I know how to be a conflict manager, I know how to adjust my attitude towards people, you know. I know how to work with this. I did this in school."

"I have four uncles and they look up to me because I'm in conflict management and I know how to solve problems. So when they want to talk about them arguing with each other, because they argue a lot, and then they come to me to talk to try and work it out. And I help them."

"Conflict manager does, what?

"If you don't have any (inaudible) now, then, you know, I think you guys should try to work something out where you can get ..."

MS. COOPER-BASCH: I was thinking about your question before all this was going on. We get many more requests for our program than we actually fill, and part of the problem is -- well, as everyone has mentioned so far, is the lack of resources. Right now we have six principals of six different high schools who don't have this program who'd like to implement it. It was part of the collaborative proposal that was submitted to the Mayor's Office of Children, Youth and Families and they were only able to fund a certain number and ours wasn't selected even though it was rated very highly.

I mean, yes, part of the problem is not every school in our state knows about Community Board. Most know about peer mediation. At least some form of peer mediation. They may not know about our program specifically but there are many, many schools who do know about our program who would like to utilize our services but don't have the resources to do that.

Some funding from our program, as I mentioned earlier, comes from the Dispute Resolution Act. That pretty much helps us -- or supplements our free dispute resolution services we provide in San Francisco. We get some funding from private foundations and community foundations. Sometimes a school will

get a partnership with a community foundation to fund a program like this. We're actually part of a small, like a very small piece of a Wellness Foundation grant to work in a couple of middle schools, and we do what we can as far as that goes. We would certainly fare better, I think, if there was some legislation passed that mandated schools to use conflict resolution and peer mediation.

President Clinton's 1993 Safe Schools Act just came out a few days ago and it does mention specifically peer mediation and conflict resolution as a means for violence prevention in schools. And as I mentioned, of course, Janet Reno is a strong proponent of our program as well.

It's a frustrating question because we are nonprofit, we have limited resources. We'd love to go to every school that's having problems and say we're here for you. But the resources need to be there and the buy-in, you know. The principals and the teachers all -- you know, you can't just throw a mediation program at a problem and think, oh well, now it's solved. Sometimes you have to have a whole school approach where teachers and administrators and parents are also taught these conflict resolution skills.

SENATOR HUGHES: Have you gone into any schools where there has been drastic physical violence and been able to remediate them? You know, it's not just where you feel a negative atmosphere but where something has really happened. Have you gone in there to help put the pieces back together?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: We've had schools come to us who've undergone a lot of problems with violence and these programs don't happen overnight either. It sometimes takes a full year and sometimes two years to have successful programs where all the students know what's happening at their school, where all the teachers feel comfortable with the program. It takes a lot of preparation and development and, hopefully, it's also supplemented with conflict resolution curriculum in the classroom.

We've had schools report back to us some pretty dramatic improvements. The National Association for Mediation and Education -- they're known as NAME -- did a study recently where schools across the country using peer mediation programs reported a decrease of suspension and drop-out rates by as much as 70 percent. So it not only affects the decreased level of violent incidents but it can also have some outlaying positive results as well.

SENATOR HUGHES: What happens to your students after they've been through a conflict resolution program, you know, in one school? Do you ever stay in touch with your students who've successfully completed a program, and then are you able to use them again in another situation?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: It's interesting. Because we're a national program, we

have these institutes where a school might send three educators to a four-day institute to learn the skills, they go back to their schools and they start a program. And we do some follow-up and we hear back -- some schools report success where older kids will go into middle and elementary schools and help train kids there and it's a wonderful cycle.

In San Francisco we're able to do much more hands-on follow-up work with schools, and there've been some dramatic results and great achievements that these kids have even as far as going into the community and teaching adults conflict resolution skills.

These student peer mediators, the results that they have personally -- this is sort of a much small percentage of the schools that get trained with these specific skills -- do better with their academic performance, their self-esteem is built up. They are able to use the skills at home, in their family life. So there's some really pretty dramatic results for them.

A lot of kids who are disputants and try these peer mediators will then, after that experience, sign up next year to become peer mediators. So there's definitely a nice cycle going on there as well.

SENATOR HUGHES: Any questions?

SENATOR HART: Yes, just to follow up to Senator Hughes' question about expanding the program. If a school district wanted to take advantage of this, basically they're going to have to come up with their own funding. And so what they could do is to call and to -- I mean, ask from some support, but basically for the materials, if they wanted to be trained, whatever, they would have to come up with the source of funding.

MS. COOPER-BASCH: At the elementary and middle schools, a school could actually purchase a set of training manuals for under $50, and if you have some committed teachers they can implement a peer mediation program based on that alone. At the high school level it's more structured and they really need to go through some formal training to set up a program. And, we'll also help in some implementation development if they'd like that and follow-up work as well.

In San Francisco and in California we do quite a lot of partnerships where we'll get a few schools in a district that are interested and then we'll find funders and sort of bring it all together, but that happens infrequently.

SENATOR HART: Besides San Francisco, are there other schools districts that are using this in California?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: Yeah. There's probably 50 different school districts in the state.

SENATOR HART: And the $3 fee that you mentioned, the filing fee, can those funds be used for this purpose or are those funds only for sort of adult

resolution to try and save the court costs?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: Well, for Community Board, we sort of have two sides of our organization. Part of the money to run our organization, that's those funds that support, like, the rent and some of those administrative costs, do go into promoting our schools work and trying to offset some of those expenses. We try to keep our prices for the training materials down as low as we possibly can. We let schools, once they purchase these materials, they can run off copies in their schools. So they don't have to buy a copy for every single teacher who's going to do some of this work.

SENATOR HUGHES: Do you go to the State School Boards Association and make them aware of your program so that they can act thus?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: We do. We're exhibiting at state school educational conferences, we're lobbying Department of Education folks. Mary Weaver's a strong proponent of our organization. As much as we can with our limited personnel resources, we try to get the word out there as much as we can.

SENATOR HART: One last question I had was, it was mentioned in the video, "Don't be judgmental." Help me with that a little bit because I understand that you want to -- if people feel like they aren't being judged they're going to be more open and you're maybe likely to get resolution. But in some instances maybe one party really is at fault and is really behaving outrageously and the other person really doesn't have much in the way of volume. I can see it when you're dealing with some situations where that would be very appropriate, but other situations it would not. This morning there was a lot of talk about how you look and if you look someway you're going to get gunned down. Well, my goodness. From my standpoint, how you look isn't an offense, really. Help me understand, are there instances where you do have to be judgmental?

MS. COOPER-BASCH: There are some community mediation programs which are called VOMP (Victim-Offender Mediation Program) where it's very clear, you know, here's the victim and here's the offender. In community mediation and in school based mediation we strongly endorse this non-judgmental, neutral mediators. We are very generous even with the offender, even if it's clear that there is a victim and an offender. We allow for him or her -- we try to see well, what's under there, what are the underlying issues which led this person to behave that way? Sometimes it does go back into some family concerns which aren't even part of the complaint that the mediation was about. I think that's one of the most important parts of peer mediation is this non-judgmental issue and being neutral and being generous.

Oftentimes, the mediation might end up with some sort of an apology and

that comes from the disputant him or herself. Sometimes we have mediations where there are gang members involved and some of the resolutions might involve saying, well, he looked at me wrong, he gave me hard looks and that's why I pulled out this knife. And now there's a lot of tension between two factions in the school and what are we going to do about it? Maybe the kid with the knife was sent to juvey hall and we're still dealing with all the tension at the school. The other guy might say, Well, you know, it all started when you accidentally tripped me and you didn't say you were sorry and it started with some little incident that just grew and grew. And at a mediation where everyone is given equal time and a neutral setting, some of those issues can come out if the trust is developed there, especially when you're with peers, with fellow students. The resolution in a case like that might be, I'm going to call off my friends. I'm going to say the problem's over, that we've discussed it, that we realize it was a miscommunication and I'm going to tell the rest of my friends in the various gangs that we're not going to do any more retaliation, you know, and there's a peace zone here.

SENATOR HART: I think in many instances -- I mean, I think it's great, but I'm just a little skeptical of the people who would exploit and use the situation and say we want to be generous with offenders. Well, maybe some people don't deserve to be dealt with generously, particularly if they're repeat offenders, if this occurs again and again. Somebody is using this mediation process as a way to avoid some real system of accountability and punishment.

MS. COOPER-BASCH: I think it's important to note that the mediation at the schools, it's not necessarily appropriate for every single case. If a real crime has been committed, it's going to go somewhere else. We do get referrals from schools for our community mediation and we often use peer mediators to sit on these panels when we have youth disputes. And we also get referrals from first and second time juvenile offenders from probation officers and juvenile court judges who feel that there is some hope here, that rather than send this kid to some ranch, there were some extenuating circumstances and if we try -- again, it's a voluntary process. The (quote/unquote) "victim" has to agree to use this process. It's not mandated. It's always a voluntary process. So both the so called victim and offender have to agree to try it, and usually if they do try it they're in a conciliatory frame of mind.

But yes, Senator Hart, I do agree that there are instances where to be generous may not be -- you know, if it's a repeated issue, a repeated kind of situation, that may not be the best approach. But peer mediation, as I see it, is an early intervention technique. It's before it's got to the point where

somebody pulled out a gun and used violence. It's tensions before they've mounted and escalated. Somebody mentioned earlier this morning that it's so hard to measure the crime that wasn't committed because of some of these interventions.

And the last thing I want to say is that I don't think that peer mediation is an answer. For me, by itself it's a Band-Aid. It really needs to be part of a comprehensive approach to schools. Senator Wright was talking earlier: Well, which program do we choose? And I'm thinking, Well, you can't just choose one and hope for the best. It's really got to be the curriculum from kindergarten and preschool on up. It's possibly peer mediation at a school. It's theater presentations that are doing conflict resolution presentations.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. I have a school district in my senatorial district where I know that there's a great conflict between Black and Hispanic students and there's a great conflict between a Black community and the Hispanic community, period, and it's filtering into the school situation and there's very little leadership coming from the school district, and the school board is a new school board and they are still suffering from some of the "sins" or the lack of competence of the past. How could your organization, or would your organization be in a position of helping us before something really explosive takes place? How could I as a legislator just sort of hint to them that you exist and could you really come and help them? That's the kind of question I want an answer to, if you have an answer. Because your program sounds wonderful and it sounds like the ideal situation that I'd like to see happen in the community in my area.

MS. COOPER-BASCH: We have in the past, and there's a little piece in our brochure that talks about our whole school approach to conflict resolution; where it sounds in that case, where there's so much tension not just among the youth but even among the leaders and the administrators, the training has to start there.

SENATOR HUGHES: With the leaders and the administrators.

MS. COOPER-BASCH: And it may be that there are community mediation programs in your area. I know in San Francisco we have done some pretty large party disputes involving different ethnic communities where it may take six months, where you meet with each group -- it might be 50 people in the room -- individually first for a few months, teach them about our program and some conflict resolution skills before you bring them in the room together to talk about some of these very, very frenetic and tense issues.

We are available to help schools who are restructuring and rethinking. We have done, especially where there's a large diverse and tense community, we've

done ongoing conflict resolution training skills for years, even before a school might implement a peer mediation program.

One thing about the peer mediation program is the kids that they use to become peer mediators -- that group, say, 20 to 30 youth. They'll train a new cadre every year. We strongly endorse that that group be very diverse. You know, both in terms of ethnicity, gender, economics, popularity. There are elementary schools who will target the (quote/unquote) "bully" to become a peer mediator and divert some of that energy into something positive and constructive. And even within this group there are maybe kids who were sort of identified as a gang member, perhaps, wrongly or rightly, and now they're part of this cadre of youth and are seen and are a role model for something much more positive and conciliatory. Even that program by itself has some pretty far reaching benefits.

SENATOR HUGHES: Any further questions, Senator Hart? Well, thank you very much. I have a greater understanding now about what your program is all about.

Daria Waetjen.

MS. WAETJEN: I know I'm here to talk about PROJECT YES!, but because I work at a county office, I have to say that we have sent a cadre of people from the county, Orange County, to be trained in conflict resolution and it is probably our most popular training. We have teachers and administrators on waiting lists to take this training, and it's become a model program used in almost every single district in our county. So that's just a little endorsement for something that districts believe works and really works well on their campuses.

PROJECT YES! is a program that's been around since 1989. Initially, the funding came from the Office of Criminal Justice Planning to assist in bringing teachers into the prevention loop.

And I heard a question earlier today -- Why do we need a curriculum to do this? A lot of what is taught in PROJECT YES! or the STAR curriculum or some of the others discussed today seem like common sense. Seem like areas that teachers address. But unfortunately, prevention education cannot be that haphazard. It has to sometimes be scripted. We can't hope that our kindergarten or our first grade or our second grade teacher taught a specific concept about culture or diversity or appreciation of other people or, for that matter, volunteerism and responsibility and then just assume that that child will carry those concepts along with them. And that's really what PROJECT YES! has done. It's scripted lessons that we hope that teachers can integrate, or actually infuse into what they're already teaching. So it's not one more content area.

The one thing we know is that teachers are overworked, they have a lot to teach. There's a lot of curriculum and content that they are required to teach. And the objective was to make these lessons compatible with what is required teaching in English, language, arts, history, social science as well as health, and that's what we've done.

I have two short excerpts that show a video news release from OCJP and our office and also a short segment of a fourth grade lesson being taught.

(SHOWING OF VIDEO)

NARRATOR: There was a time not so long ago when the worst things kids had to fear at school were fist fights with the local bully. Unfortunately, times have changed.

"Gangs, violence and drugs are undermining the safety of California students. According to the National Crime Survey, almost three million crimes occur on or near school campuses every year. This certainly is a learning distraction for our students and this type of violence can be prevented."

NARRATOR: To address this situation, the California Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Planning has funded development of PROJECT YES!, a prevention curriculum designed to help teach California students techniques which enhance their safety and prevent drug use and gang violence. It receives funding from Lucky Stores and was expanded this fall from grades 3, 5, and 7 to include grades 2, 4, and 6, with Spanish translations.

"What makes this program truly unique is that if we use the critical prevention message into the required subjects of history, social science, and English, language, arts, it can also be taught away from the classroom at special events and activities for students, as we are doing here this weekend at camp."

"Well, it has taught me what gangs and drugs could do to me and others and it has also taught me to respect myself and have a high self-esteem."

"It has taught us that joining gangs is bad for us, it could hurt us and it could hurt other people."

"PROJECT YES! has taught me to don't be angry because you could lose a lot of stuff like your family, your friends, and you wouldn't be safe."

NARRATOR: PROJECT YES! is currently taught in 170 California school districts. It is available through the Orange County Department of Education, and any California school purchasing the curriculum this year will receive 50 percent funding from Lucky Stores, corporate sponsor of PROJECT YES!

"Okay, class, was everyone able to complete their television viewing sheets from last week? (Yes.) Good. I've got mine here, too. Can anyone tell me who was surprised by what they saw and recorded? I thought so. Jerry, why don't you share your results with the class."

"My show was a spy movie. They used a lot of different weapons and they had guns and bombs."

"Ooh. Anything else?"

"Well, there were cars running over people."

"Were there many people hurt in this show?"

"Yes."

"How many?"

"A lot. It was hard to tell because they had machine guns and bombs."

"Oh. Sounds like a pretty gruesome movie, huh? How many people were killed?"

"Well, I don't know but I know that for sure that five were killed on purpose."

"Oh. Thank you, Jerry. Now, Jerry's spy movie is a good example of pretend or fantasy violence and sometimes it isn't easy to tell the difference between fantasy or real life. Can anyone come up with an instance where you found it hard to separate the two? Maria?"

"Last week I saw a show on TV and I was pretty scared to go to bed."

"Why?"

"Because sometimes there is fighting going on on my street and it looks just like that."

"Mmm. Okay. Sometimes it seems that fantasy and real life disagreements have something in common. They may use violence as a way to solve problems. Now, many people are so used to violence nowadays because they see so much violence on TV. Now, while we're in our groups why don't we see if we can come up with some responsible ways to solve problems, okay?"

MS. WAETJEN: That lesson is an excerpt of a fourth grade lesson that we teach to help children really understand that they see so much violence that maybe they are not even aware of it or they are confusing what real and fantasy are.

And I think one of the discussions this morning that hit home for me in the contents that we've developed as part of this curriculum is the desensitization of children to violence. If you watch children with weapons, play with toy weapons, we're very careful in the curriculum to talk about weapons not as toy weapons but as fake weapons, for the very reason that by perpetuating the concept that you can play with a gun or a knife we are also perpetuating that it's an acceptable means of play, and we don't try to emphasize that in the curriculum.

The content is for grades 2 through 7 and it's been adapted for younger

grades and also for our high school students. And the key audience are all children. We do not look at just at-risk youth or suburban or urban areas. All children are at risk of being a victim of violence, as we know. Therefore, we've targeted the entire classroom, and any intervention means that would be necessary for students or children that are more involved would be another program. This, as I said, is primary prevention.

Technical assistance is also offered as well as staff development and training. We found, although the program initially had scripted lessons and content as well as a teaching manual, that a parent component and a community education component was quite necessary. And we have video and audio support tapes that help the teacher or the school deliver that information to their parents or members of the community.

We also found, after the first year of implementation, that many teachers were hesitant to address this theme area because they weren't comfortable with it. We do a one-day staff development training and we train throughout the state, finding that the curriculum is more effectively implemented when teachers have the opportunity to network with other educators and also develop an implementation plan that works for them.

There are five critical themes that are addressed in the content and they are the prevention themes that our task force of 60 members felt were most critical. The first one being responsible citizenship: We do law-related education, sense of community, volunteerism as part of those theme areas. Cultural diversity, where we actually allow children to experience cultural bonding from very early grades. Choices and consequences: Understanding that choices we make -- even choices where we don't anticipate consequences -- do sometimes have horrendous consequences. Refusal skills: We try very hard to make children practice and generalize, doing no rather than saying no. And we also emphasize success and achievement. And of all the lessons, our children's response, the student response to that area of success and achievement seems to be the most critical. It's a matter of empowering their dreams, allowing them to dream, offering them heroes, real-life heroes and heroines.

SENATOR HUGHES: How many school districts are you serving at the present time?

MS. WAETJEN: Well, there are 170 school districts in California using the program and over 300 nationally. It's hard to disseminate from that how many students are actually receiving the content because districts can implement at different grade levels and in a variety of different ways. We did not dictate one implementation plan. We have teachers in most areas delivering the curriculum but we also have school resource officers, community members and

interns that also deliver it.

SENATOR HART: Could I ask -- I'm going to have to leave, for which I apologize, and I want to thank you, Senator Hughes, and everyone for their participation in this today. You mentioned, or the video mentioned that Lucky Stores is putting up half of the money?

MS. WAETJEN: Yes.

SENATOR HART: How much money has Lucky Stores contributed to this effort? Do you have any idea?

MS. WAETJEN: They have contributed $250,000.

SENATOR HART: So that means there's...

MS. WAETJEN: It was a grant block sum, and we still have funds available that we deliver.

SENATOR HART: So Lucky puts up half the funding and OCJP puts up the rest?

MS. WAETJEN: No. OCJP paid for our start-up funds for the actual development of the curriculum, and the rest of the development costs are absorbed by our office and, hopefully, the sales of the curriculum.

SENATOR HART: And is that involvement by Lucky, is that ongoing?

MS. WAETJEN: Until that grant sum is finished, until we use that up, and then we will pursue another corporate sponsor, maybe in a different fashion, to support training. But that was their initial funding, $250,000, and we still have funds available.

SENATOR HART: Do you have a sense from the corporate community what their -- I mean, there seems to be so much media interest and community interest in the issue of violence in the schools. Is this something that's easy to involve the corporate community or is there a lot of skepticism and their resources are very limited and there's really not much out there?

MS. WAETJEN: Well, I think part of it is timing and the agenda of the organization of the corporation. I think we timed it well approaching Lucky. I do think that there is a very strong -- from the chamber of commerce and different community organizations we've met with, that corporations are interested in safe communities and this is an area that they are willing to look at.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Any further questions? Thank you very much, both of you, for coming. You've made us more aware of some of the other programs that are available as resources to us.

Now, this part of the agenda, we'll have some input from the audience, participants. Yes, you want to come up?

MR. KEN HURDLE: My name is Ken Hurdle and I'm with the Senate Office of Research. Our office was responsible for finding some of the programs to come

here today. I just wanted to say that we went through many programs in order to choose these, what we have. There was a particular message we wanted to try and get across, and some of this addresses what you were thinking of earlier, Senator Wright.

One thing that we found in our survey -- and we're currently doing a survey for the committee and we sent out to over 300 different school districts and groups to find out how their programs work, to find out what was unique with each one. One thing that we have found that's been unique with each program is that each program is designed for that particular school. So to have something unique out of STAR or something else and carried over to someone else's program doesn't necessarily work because these programs are different.

We also found that the programs can be broken down into several different types. There are programs that deal especially or mostly with drugs. There are programs that deal with gangs, there are programs that deal with guns. So each community focuses on what they feel is their problem and they kind of address it that way.

SENATOR HUGHES: What historically has been the role of the Superintendent of Public Instruction? And since we don't have an official Superintendent now, and we hope to get one in the future, what has been the Superintendent's role in terms of seeing that these programs were available and school districts were aware of the kind of choices that they made and did they have a role or had they no role?

MR. HURDLE: I can't answer that completely because my background on this issue is not education per se, but I've been involved with some of the school safety programs in my position at Senate Office of Research. So I don't think I can answer that directly. Although I can say that I know that the Superintendent of Schools has supported in the past different bills relating to school safety, multi-cultural diversity training at an earlier age; and a lot of those bills, frankly, just never made it out of committee, like your bill. So there has been -- you were mentioning earlier about why address it just to these older folks but the younger kids, too -- there have been bills in the past six years that I've been around in this area that did address multi-cultural diversity, and not necessarily Black or white, but this thing of how everyone is part of the same picture. So I can't address your question directly as to what the Superintendent of Schools does because I'm not an education person but a school safety person.

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, how significant, do you think, is the role of the community groups? For instance, Lucky has stepped forth and become very instrumental in this program and we're very proud of that. Do you think that's

the kind of support we need, since the state doesn't have any money per se, that we need more private industry coming forth and assisting us in these efforts?

MR. HURDLE: Well, the programs that I've looked into or that I've read about or visited, etc., that seemed to work all have a collaborative type of part to them where there has been PTA's, Lucky's, Kiwanis, Rotary's, volunteer groups -- One Hundred Black Men. There are some Hispanic groups. The ones that seem to work don't have a lot of money but know how to get other people to become involved in it. And that was one of the focuses for us picking the programs that we did: to show that things can be done without a lot of state money but also to show folks at the state level there are programs out there that work, and maybe if we kind of, not necessarily support them but encourage that type of collaborative work it will save the state money in the long run because we don't want to have them in our juvenile justice system.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Can I ask you a question? Back in that time period when the Treasurer was a member of the Los Angeles Unified School District, then Attorney General Deukmejian filed a lawsuit in regards to the violence in the Los Angeles schools. I haven't been able to find out how that was finally resolved because he didn't only bring it against the school district, he brought it against the county board of supervisors, city council people. It was a whole collective thing as far as Los Angeles was concerned.

And so all these programs we're hearing, it seems that it comes back to that it can't be the school in isolation. It has to be a situation where it's community involvement, organization involvement. It has to seem to be a whole program. Then I find it'd be very difficult for us to institute legislation directed at violence in schools when it seems that it has to be something that has the flexibility so the whole community can be involved in it. And so I'm sitting here in a quandary as to how that would be addressed. Have you got any ideas in that area?

MR. HURDLE: Well, I think the role of the Legislature in addressing this issue is, one, to be supportive, which does not necessarily mean financially supportive but to become involved. There are organizations within the state like Office of Criminal Justice Planning or Mike Carrington and those folks. There are different groups already within the state government or that are already assigned to do these things that aren't necessarily doing what they're supposed to be doing, or if they all came together at the same table and started talking about how we can do this, it can work -- you know, back the work, too. Because one of the things in the community groups, or the programs I've seen in the communities, there were a lot of programs doing their own

thing and then a PROJECT YES! would come in or Peace Builders would come in and they would say, oh, that seems to work. They would come together and then they were much more successful than trying to do a lot on their own. So I think even at the state level there has to be that collaborative of the Department of Education.

SENATOR HUGHES: I was wondering, do you know how much information sharing is done between agencies of state government? That boggles my mind because that's one of the things that we've tried to do in the Committee on Teenage Pregnancy, to get all of these -- and the Governor's office has been very helpful on that, when we had a resolution to get these agencies to interact. So maybe we need to have a comparable resolution to get these agencies to interact and tell us what each is doing in terms of school violence. Because I don't know that anybody is speaking to anyone else. Everybody's about their own appointed task and doing the best they can. I'm not condemning them but they're doing the best they can within their limitations.

MR. MIKE CARRINGTON: I'd like to speak to that.

SENATOR HUGHES: Yeah, okay, would you speak to that after him?

MR. HURDLE: Mike can probably speak to that, but generally speaking, not only in the school violence but I also do disability issues, so we can talk about disability groups not within the state not talking to each other, but there is some of that.

SENATOR HUGHES: It seems like I asked the right question.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Isn't there also, a parcel of that is turf?

MR. HURDLE: Yes, there's turf. And everyone has to kind of realize that the turf belongs to everyone and it becomes greener if we all work together.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Because I hate to keep touting but, I mean, that's how I got involved with the mental health with youngsters, was the fact because we had all these programs but nobody was talking to each other. And when I mention the Ventura Project, that's what the whole thing's about. Believe it or not, the board is made up of juvenile justice, special education ... (inaudible).

MR. HURDLE: ... we were talking about weapons and you had an issue about guns, the violence and that kind of thing. If you go back to the reports of 1987, '88, '89 on school violence, actual use of guns as violence on campus was small compared to the kids that were being beat up for their lunch money. That kind of violence is much more prevalent than guns. And I think for the Legislature to focus just totally on guns, which is what sells -- that's what you see on TV -- is not right.

SENATOR HUGHES: But how much of that violence is fatal, you know? I mean,

are kids hitting their heads on the pavement and having brain concussions or seizures or something like that as opposed to the bullet that goes through the leg or through the chest and takes them out? You know, so I think we're talking about the most critical types of violence.

MR. HURDLE: Yes, I agree with you on that, but there are also some studies from the Midwest where they talk about these issues. You're talking about brain injury, other things that come as a result of that violence, or kids dropping out of school because they were beat up for their lunch money three days in a row. So that is a permanent in some areas. I mean, it's not fatal but it's an issue to be addressed.

But the last thing I wanted to say was that when you were asking about how do we know it works, what makes it works, etc., etc., there have been studies by the Centers for Disease Control that have said that none of these programs work and other people say none of these programs work. But they always almost put the caveat -- there are these anecdotal things and this is what I found when I was out down doing these tours. There's a lot of anecdotal things of where teachers feel better, principals feel better or students feel better because there's not as much of that going on. You can't survey every single school to find out where the crime has gone, because you don't know which ones were not committed so what did you prevent. So when we look at what works and doesn't work, I think it also needs to be considered the feel good kind of issue because that has a major part to be played in whether or not there's going to be any violence.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you. Yes.

MR. MIKE CARRINGTON: Madam Chair, Mike Carrington. I'm Deputy Director of the Office of Criminal Justice Planning for Planning and Policy Development. First of all, I'd like to thank you for holding these hearings on this very important subject. It's one of the most serious things that we face in society today. Governor Wilson is very concerned about the issue. School violence and crime are at the top of his agenda.

I'd like to share with the committee today some of the things that are taking place in this area that we shared with the Assembly committee earlier this year to let you know some of the developments that are occurring and to make some observations on what has been talked about here today. I know the Legislature is looking for some direction, some suggestion on where they need to go, what can be done. Some of the answers are somewhat simplistic, some are not so easy.

But one thing, I took special note of something that Kathleen Brown touched on this morning and that was the D.A.R.E. and S.A.N.E. programs which have been

so extremely successful in our schools involving law enforcement and working with our local schools. She indicated that there were not enough of these programs to go around and, in fact, doesn't exist anymore. Unfortunately, the $26 million for this program, which served roughly 4 million children in California, was stricken from the budget last year. The program was left on the books but the money was taken out. It might be instructive to pursue that situation. I know there's been quite an outcry at the local level, once they realized this had happened -- it was kind of an eleventh-hour situation -- and I think there's a lot of cry for the program to come back out there. This is a program that our office administered. It might be instructive to find out why it was taken out and at whose behest. I think the presumption was that some elements of the education establishment were the ones who requested to the Legislature that that money be transferred elsewhere. I don't know where it went exactly but I know that the program isn't in existence anymore. That's something that could help make a difference.

I'd like to share with you some of the things that we're looking to develop in this area, and you quite correctly point out the need for coordination. We have done this quite significantly in the area of gangs particularly. Our office has the statutory responsibility for administering much of the state and federal grant money for anti-crime programs as well as for victim services for victims of crime. Our office has undertaken, under the leadership of Kirby Everhart, who is a consultant to the credentialing committee that you heard from earlier, bringing together the disparate activities and groups in the gang area, and we've done that successfully in creating a statewide Anti-Gang Coordinating Committee which functions very well bringing everybody together, and we want to try to do this also in the area of school violence and crime there.

In March of last year, at the direction of Governor Wilson, the California Council on Criminal Justice, which is the highest statutory body in this state for policy in that area, was asked to undertake the development of some new programs and concepts dealing with the area of gangs, drugs, and of course, all this relates to school violence quite significantly. Our office has been working a staff in the development of that program.

When this started, we had to ask ourselves some very hard questions about the issue of violence: Why is this occurring on the campuses? Why are these kids doing what they're doing? What's the root cause? And in talking with a number of people and organizations who work with young people, we came down to some basic premises and it may be signifi ant to take note of this.

What we determined initially was that when you strip away all the hype and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

discussion and you bring it down to the individual student level, the individual person -- there's a phrase that the Governor has used in the development of this program; it's what we're dealing with here on an individual basis -- is what we call a "crisis of the human spirit." There's so many needs out there. There's so many problems in our society today, especially that young people have to face. They're under such tremendous pressures. Modern day social scientists have told us over the last few decades that major contributors to this problem are poverty, the breakdown of the family; and certainly these are contributing factors, but it's not quite that simple. In fact, that belies the reality out there that there are thousands of families out there who, unfortunately, live under these circumstances but their kids do not get into drugs, they do not get into gangs, they do not cause trouble, they do not intimidate their fellow students, they don't carry guns. What is it that those families possess that the others do not? That's an area of focus.

One of the other things that we asked ourselves in looking at this problem, is there any tangible evidence of groups or organizations out there that really do make a difference with these kids and break through this cycle? And I'm happy to report to you that yes, there are.

One example that we use is a tremendous organization based out of Stockton, California by the name of Radical Reality. This is an organization that goes into the schools all over the United States and it consists of three young men. One's a former football star from UOP. His name is Donny Moore. He's white. The other fellow involved is Darwin Benjamin. He is a former drug dealer, drug user and gang member. He's a Black man who is now a counselor at the California Youth Authority. And one other fellow named Scott Ruiz who's a Hispanic young man. These are all great big muscle guys and the first part of their program they do with young people is a series of martial arts and physical strength demonstration. It gets the kids attention. But the more important second half of the program gets in to what these kids are facing today and addresses why they do what they do. And I'd heard so much about this program I finally went to see it myself because I couldn't believe what I was hearing. I went out to Mills Junior High School in Sacramento, which is, I think, a pretty average ethnically diverse school in the State of California, and I watched this presentation. And when it was finished, it was quite a revelation. When they were done with their program these kids, hundreds of them, came streaming out of the bleachers onto the gymnasium floor where these men were standing, most of them in tears. And at the feet of these men fell drugs, weapons, gang colors. It was incredible! And I stood there for over an hour and listened to what these young people had to say after this

presentation.

One of the most prevalent comments I heard from these young people was that they had never felt such love as they felt in that room at that moment. And I said that's quite a commentary on our society. They talked about parents who use drugs, who sell drugs, peer pressure, suicide thoughts, gangs. All of the things that young people have to do just came pouring out of them. The principal, who's a Black man, came over to me and he was crying. He was just absolutely -- he said, "I have never seen anything like this in my life." He said, "We have hundreds of programs that come through this school and we pay thousands of dollars for them and they're not worth a darn." He said, "This changes kids."

This same group, let me create a more difficult circumstance for you, if you will, when we're talking about violence and what's happening out there today. You probably couldn't get any more violent confrontation circumstances than putting in the same room a group of the Bloods and the Cripps. Well, the members of those two gangs were incarcerated. Many of them are incarcerated at a CYA institution in Northern California. I got a letter from a gang counselor down there who witnessed this. They put 250 of these young men in the same room for this presentation that this group did and, again, when it was finished, over a hundred of them absolutely broke down. All the animosity, the hate, the violence was gone. They were hugging each other. The gang counselor was incredulous, he'd never seen anything like it.

There's a message here. I don't know if any of you have seen Edward Olmos' film, "American Me," but there's a scene in that film when the young Hispanic men are sitting in the graveyard in that tomb talking about why they're into what they're into and the voids in their lives, the emptiness, the lack of structure and belonging. That's a lot of what we're dealing with.

So how does government answer this question? Can we solve the crisis of the human spirit as a government? No. But, the next question is: Are there groups and structures that can? The answer is: Yes. We have a lot of resources in our community that are capable of dealing with this, and what we're looking at doing is bringing back to bear to the problem. We have been in the process of putting some working groups together, different components. One with the religious community in this state; second, with the media and entertainment industry, who have a great deal to do with this, in our opinion; and with the private sector, with corporate California. Senator Hart raised a good point about should they be involved and would they be interested.

Let me address each of those. We have met with a number of religious leaders in this state who recognize the problem and are willing to help on an

organized basis.

We have had very serious and hard discussions with the media and entertainment industry. And we're talking role model situations here. If you watch much of MTV or you listen to a lot of the music and you see a lot of the films, and Senator Wright, your depiction of the good guys and the bad guys and the cowboys and the Indians before was, I think, very accurate. Today it's not the clear definition, but the bad guy is, in effect, glorified and has almost become a role model which has had, in a lot people's opinion, a devastating effect. So is there a level of responsibility there? I am glad to tell you that there are major elements in the entertainment industry who are willing to address this issue and we're very happy about that.

In terms of the private sector, there are a number of corporate leaders in California who are desperately wanting to help. Let me tell you, though, the caveat here. They're not interested in backing, for lack of a better word, a lot of flimflam programs. They want to see something that really works, that really changes kids' lives. If we can show that to them they will jump in and help.

In our fiscal climate today of limited resources, which I'm not an economic expert but I see going on for a few years yet, if we're really serious about dealing with this problem we have to create public-private partnerships. The money's not going to be there and I'm not sure that putting ourselves further in bonded indebtedness is the answer if the resources are out there for free, in effect. People who are willing to help, who have the resources to do that. So we're going to be pursuing that.

PROJECT YES! is a classic example of a public-private partnership that saved a lot of money and is doing a lot of good, and we're very grateful to Mr. Del Santo and all the people at Lucky Stores for that great show of corporate responsibility and they're to be commended for that. And I think there are a lot of others out there who would do the same thing.

So we're going to be pursuing this. After the first of the year we will be formalizing this proposal to work with all of these entities in the state to create this environment, to coordinate the effort, to put an umbrella out there to bring all of these resources to bear and we're very excited about that.

SENATOR WRIGHT: You talked about this Radical Reality group. How are they funded?

MR. CARRINGTON: Privately. They receive no government money whatsoever. They're totally private funded. There's another organization in Los Angeles which just recently did a whole segment on "20/20" or "60 Minutes" called Victory Outrage. They do incredible things with young people in Los Angeles.

There's another musical group called Tovanni that's just, in the last few months, been responsible for bringing over 6,000 kids out of the gang situation. These things are happening out there. Government, instead of standing in their way, should help these groups function and do what only they can do.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I've never heard of this Radical Reality. Have they gone up and down the state?

MR. CARRINGTON: They are all over the United States. In fact, probably one of the most instructive things you could do is to go see one of their assemblies or have them come and testify and show their videotape. We had that done at the Governor's Policy Council last July. It was incredible. But they're a tangible living example of what really works.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Is it teams or is it just these three gentlemen?

MR. CARRINGTON: It's just them. However, they are interested in working to replicate what they do. One of the things they do is work with the young people inside the institutions. Once those lives are changed those young men go back out into the community and do the same thing. And, of course, there's no greater effect than to have one of their peers, who can talk the talk, be right there to show the way out of what they're into.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right, moving right along. Thank you so much for your testimony.

MS. MARY WEAVER: Hi, I'm Mary Weaver from the California Department of Education. I also would like to thank you very much for having these hearings. We've had staff at each of the meetings to be able to hear all of the testimony that has been presented, and for that we really appreciate the opportunity.

I'd like to restate also what I've heard Mike saying in terms of the role that OCJP has been taking in terms of bringing various agencies together, and we do serve, along with many other state agencies, on the Gang Suppression Task Force. On a monthly basis we are able to share our strategies or programs so that we not only do not duplicate each other's activities but that we support...

SENATOR HUGHES: So you do actually share.

MS. WEAVER: We do share and we do meet on a monthly basis. The second Thursday of each month.

SENATOR HUGHES: How long have you been doing this?

MS. WEAVER: It's been close to a year, I'd say. Maybe a year.

SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. So it's fairly recent.

MS. WEAVER: Fairly new, yes.

SENATOR HUGHES: But that's good and we'd like to encourage you to do more

of it.

MS. WEAVER: Good. Well, we will indeed do that because it's something we very much believe in. I say that not only from the Department of Education but the other agencies that also serve on that.

You had asked what was the role of education, and although we do not have a State Superintendent of Public Instruction, our acting State Superintendent is very much committed to safe schools as was former Superintendent Bill Honig. We have school safety as one of our three major priorities within the department this year. We have had major activities with the Office of the Attorney General since 1983 with our school-law enforcement partnership. That partnership is made up of a cadre of well over 80 professionals, both in law enforcement and from education, that serve school districts and other requesting agencies on any questions that they might have pertaining to school safety. They go out and they provide that service at no cost to any of the requesting entities.

We also conduct two conferences each year and in those conferences we have been able to, in the past, promote PROJECT YES!. We have been able to promote those programs such as Community Board and Conflict Resolution. We look at what is the current topic or the hot item, you might say, in terms of safe schools and we promote those topics.

In addition, we do provide grants that have been provided through local assistance Proposition 98 monies for helping schools to implement their existing safe school plans.

This current year we're having some new additional emphases and we will be working with communities along with the Attorney General's Office in our partnership program. We will be having two meetings during the month of April in which we will bring community leaders together to work as a school community to address gang violence and gang awareness prevention. The focus, the emphasis will be on gang prevention but, indeed, it will have to do with building community action teams so that they can then go back and serve as catalysts within their own communities to help prevent the continuing escalation that we see at this point of gang influence in schools and communities.

We will have a new publication that will be coming out in January called "On Alert." It is gang in-service guidelines. It will go to school administrators, it will go throughout the state. We will also promote that through our community action groups.

In addition, we're going to be conducting a pilot program beginning in the winter. The arrangements are being finalized at this point. We will go into

three schools districts -- Central, Northern and Southern California. We will deal specifically with conflict resolution programs. We will be building within a school...

SENATOR HUGHES: Have those districts been chosen already?

MS. WEAVER: We have two that have expressed interest. We're looking for a Northern California school district. And we will be looking at trying to pull not only the high school, that feeder -- the middle school that goes into the high school -- as well as a feeder elementary school.

SENATOR HUGHES: (Inaudible.)

MS. WEAVER: Indeed, the commitment is there and we're working together.

SENATOR WRIGHT: I saw you nodding your head when I mentioned about that lawsuit. Do you know what the result of that was?

MS. WEAVER: A bit. I do know that the whole culmination of not only that lawsuit but also the other studies that had been done in the Los Angeles area at that time, and that goes back into the late '70s and early '80s, is that schools at that point in time were the safe havens within the community. And so it was viewed that schools were the safe spots, the communities were not. With the cooperation of the Attorney General's Office we did go into schools in this area and found that reiterated time and time again. If we were to go back and look now it may be a different situation.

But as far as the actual case, we just know that the ultimate was that there were fearful thoughts as to the lawsuit but it did not, it's my understanding, go to culmination.

SENATOR WRIGHT: My understanding was that it was brought basically to highlight the fact that the problem was growing out there, and it seems that the Los Angeles -- I was even surprised when they said Los Angeles was not the number one district as far as violence.

I was just wondering because I know it was to try and highlight and to get some changes made within the district, and of course, I've never seen any changes made within the district, so...

MR. CARRINGTON: The premise, I think, Senator, was that there's legal climate that one of the -- it's like a constitutional right to have a safe school and that, in effect, was being violated and that was the premise under which it was moving, to elevate the issue.

MS. WEAVER: That also came in Proposition 8 -- Victims Bill of Rights -- which created in our Constitution Article I, Section 28 (c), which was a two or three line section that gave the constitutional guarantee to all students and staff to attend schools.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Just goes to show you it's guaranteed but we still can't

do it.

MS. WEAVER: It's a hard task.

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, thank you very much for your testimony.

Last, but my no means least, a person who faces the real hard story all the time. A teacher from the school district in El Monte, Brian Astregin.

MR. FRED CORTES: May I also ... (inaudible) ...

SENATOR HUGHES: Great. Well, it's important. See, we're hearing from the real people last so you always save the best to last.

MR. BRIAN ASTREGIN: Thank you very much for your time.
I think it's important that we first look at the difference between a school yard fight and...

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Tell us what do you teach, where do you teach, and what grade level.

MR. ASTREGIN: Okay. I'm the teacher in charge of discipline at Mountain View High School in El Monte, California. I have 8 years experience both in school security and in classroom instruction.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Is it elementary, junior high, or high?

MR. ASTREGIN: High school.

What I was saying is I think it's important that we look at the difference between a school yard fight and the ongoing gang violence that is plaguing our schools, and also, it's important that we know the difference between the perimeter and on campus. I think that a lot of times the media tends to blow it out of proportion when we have incidents that occur down the street from the campus and occur on the perimeter of the school that don't actually involve students of that particular campus.

There's no question that we do have weapons on campus and we do have drugs on campus, but I think it's moderation is the form. I don't feel it's as widespread as the media would like to portray it as.

What I would ask of Ms. Hughes and Ms. Wright is that we try and earmark some funds for school security and have that fund specifically earmarked for training of school administrators and school security personnel to recognize the difference between disciplinary problems and actual criminal weapons being on campus and acts of violence that occur.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Earlier today, in fact before lunch, we had Reseda High School in which I asked a teacher there, because he said he'd been teaching at the school for 14 years, if he saw any difference today between the drug use, the drug abuse on campus. Do they reach a peak and now do they see it kind of trailing off as more and more focus has been placed upon it? Do you see that it's accelerated? Do you see it's the same as it was several years ago? You

said you've been involved 8 years?

MR. ASTREGIN: That's correct.

SENATOR WRIGHT: Do you see any difference between when you first came in to the system and now in regards to drug related actions with youngsters on school property?

MR. ASTREGIN: Yes. When I first started there was a lot of marijuana. Now I see ice, ecstasy, and other narcotic substances in the schools that I hadn't seen in the previous years. Also, I think the degree of weapons have increased. Beginning in my career it was common for knives to be on campus. Now it's not uncommon for students to have baseball bats in their backpacks, billy clubs, and the availability of firearms are more prevalent.

SENATOR HUGHES: Next witness, please.

MR. FRED CORTES: I'd like to share some information that...

SENATOR HUGHES: Your name, sir, and where you teach.

MR. CORTES: I'm Freddie G. Cortes from Compton, Senator Hughes.

SENATOR HUGHES: Mr. Cortes, are you a teacher?

MR. CORTES: I am a teacher but not in the Compton Unified School District, even though I taught years ago upon graduation from this University here, Cal State Northridge. This is my alma mater.

SENATOR HUGHES: But you're not presently a teacher in Compton.

MR. CORTES: No. I am not teaching in Compton. I'm teaching in Los Angeles Unified School District and that's where my child also attends.

It was last year when you came to our community. I remember Mr. Ortega, who is an attorney in Compton, had called for a meeting so we could start working together with the state. I believe this was before the district and we were trying to work with people who where in the Legislature and also locally at the county level and also in the city.

But now we have seen that the conditions are deteriorating. The parents tried to come to resolution recently, and as the report indicates, some parents were even denied access on campus. Mr. Madrid is the bilingual person who is acting as spokesperson for this group that was formed recently -- Parents and Students of Compton Unified. We have attended meetings there and what we're trying to do is deal with the violence that for some time now has plagued that community.

We had a situation where, for instance, a child was killed and this was on the way home from school. The local authorities...

SENATOR HUGHES: How recent was this?

MR. CORTES: This was at the time that you honored us with your visit, which is last year and Mr. Ortega was looking into the case because the

education authorities denied any liability, saying that it hadn't happened on campus, that the child had been killed outside and that was a community problem.

Now, it is true that the community's experiencing some problems and not only Compton, though we hear, for instance, Black, African American and Latino people come to blows. We recently had a situation in the jails where they had to call a lock-down and then some inmates were injured. I guess that is now prevalent in our community at large.

I'd like to touch on the community where I worked years ago and where I reside with my children. Of course, my children were afraid of going to school because if a child goes to school and then you have someone getting killed, then this does something to the students. They do not want to go to an unsafe campus. We believe that it's not the patrolmen, the security guards who will bring the safety. So that may be something that is being misplaced. We're wasting funds.

What we think is we have to work as the total entire community. For Instance, we have an educator and he's the Mayor of Compton. Recently, as recently as a couple of months ago, he had some unfortunate comments where it was perceived as an insult to the Jewish community. Of course, he tried to defend or put forth some messages that the Black rappers were being used or abused or they were being portrayed in a different light, but his comments were unsatisfactory because he alienated the rabbis in the Jewish American community. And being an educator, we think that we need to look into areas of cultural sensitivity.

The county is already working there. We had a meeting last Saturday and topics that we were exploring were safe campus, community, student multi-cultural activities at school, parent (inaudible) mechanism, the home school communication. This happened at Compton High School where the fights had happened between Latinos and African Americans. Again, this is after the article that -- I provided a copy and I apologize for the copy that was cut. The machine broke down on me and I had to rush back to the meeting, so I'm sorry. I apologize but we're open to provide you with more recent information.

The meeting on Saturday, November 13th, we had groups of parents, groups of students, the community at large and we did something that should be done: Have a meeting that's open for anyone to come in and wihtin some reason express ideas, if you will, vent anger, but do not bring violent attitudes.

Now, Mr. Madrid was deprived of his right to attend the meeting and the excuse given was that he was not a parent of a student at Compton High School. That is unsatisfactory. We are looking into that. I think that only alienates

these two communities, the two minorities.

Also at the meeting that we had in the auditorium, the feelings from the African American community were such that they were trying to divide us rather than bring us together. The agenda had these different topics...

SENATOR HUGHES: Who called this meeting?

MR. CORTES: This meeting was called by the district, and as you know, the district is under intervention...

SENATOR HUGHES: When you say the "district", who in the district called the meeting? The acting superintendent or whom? See, they don't have a regular superintendent. Who called the meeting?

MR. CORTES: To the best of our information, the principal was in charge and he...

SENATOR HUGHES: The principal of Compton High School?

MR. CORTES: Of the high school. Mr. William Cervant, Jr., and his staff. They had invited the county human relations consultants to come and see if they could give us training into cultural sensitivity, the areas that I mentioned earlier. We had Mrs. Marilyn, Mrs. Longoria and Mr. Olive come over and meet with us. The problem here was that the sentiment coming from the African American parents was that they were trying to divide us because they had group 1, group 2 and group 3 to explore these different topics. So the parents got up and they immediately demanded to have access to all the topics rather than be sent to Room 214, Room 202 or the Library.

So we think at this point that the state, because we are now experiencing the state intervention, in our view it was welcome. It was welcome and even today we see that Mr. Murray is experiencing some difficulties with some people, mostly coming from the school district because they fear for their employment. And the local school board has a person who is at odds with the state trustee, Mr. Oswald.

So we'd like to see the state intervene by sending us from your office on intergroup relations -- we have knowledge of the group that works...

SENATOR HUGHES: From the state departments. The Senate doesn't have an office on intergroup relations.

MR. CORTES: Right. We like to have these two communities come together and look at all these problems because the tensions are high, it's racially motivated, and if the adults, especially those in charge, as I said, the educator who is now the mayor, have comments that have impact on another community we're not going to solve anything. We only cite that because we like to, as Latinos, have our culture looked upon favorably.

SENATOR HUGHES: I understand. I'm here to help. This hearing was about

violence and it's relevant because you're talking about tension that causes violence ultimately. And if your request to this committee is that we have the State Department of Education's Intergroup Relations Unit intervene in Compton, I would certainly, as a representative of a portion of Compton -- remember, I don't represent all of Compton, I only have the northern tip -- but as a member of the Legislature and as a member of the Education Committee, I'd be glad to write a letter to the State Department of Education asking them to have Intergroup Relations to intervene and give us an assessment of the problem there and how they can solve it.

What the purpose of this hearing was, was to gather data on programs that are effective in terms of avoiding violence on school campuses.

Now, what you bring up is a major, major, major problem because of the problem that you have with just an interim superintendent, because of the problem that you have with new members of your board, new leadership in your community that really hasn't gotten together yet and it's much too late for them to even just think about it. They've got to get together, they've got to begin to think together how they preserve the entire city of Compton, let alone the school district. And all of the other things that you brought up were unfortunate things of the past but we have to look towards the future.

I appreciate your coming here. I appreciate your making the suggestion about the intervention of Intergroup Relations and any other suggestions that you have. We are open to it. We are about to solve the problems of the entire state. Compton is just one of the areas where there are potential explosions. I do appreciate your sitting here and waiting this long to speak, and it is indeed a pleasure and an honor to hear a teacher who teaches in another district who is truly committed to education and knowing that you want to have good education. I'm sure you probably would love to have your child just to be able to go to school somewhere near where you live. But knowing of the upheaval in the area and the community and the split between the two cultural groups, Mrs. Wright and I would like for everybody to go back to pre-kindergarten and take these courses on intergroup relations. We think it would help but you can't teach some old dogs new tricks. We have to start from where we are now. We have to try to comply with your request. We'll attempt to do that. And any other ideas that you have to help us, whether it's in El Monte, San Francisco, Oakland, San Diego, or what have you, how we can squelch some of this violence, whether it's advertising the fact that was just advertised today, that some of the state agencies are finally getting together on what they're doing about juvenile violence and protecting our kids in their schools. And we can't look too far backwards. We have to look far in the

distance, in the future, to see what we can do to make things better.

And before there is more aggravation and tension as people fight the mere survival of the freeway, I'd like to say that this meeting is adjourned, and I thank you all very, very much for being so patient and attending here today. We have gathered a tremendous amount of data. I appreciate my colleagues being with us because that's really what it's all about.

Thank you very much. This meeting is adjourned.

--ooOoo--

765-S

Additional copies of this publication may be purchased for $5.50 per copy **plus 7.75% California sales tax.**

Senate Publications
1020 N Street, B-53
Sacramento, CA 95814

Make checks payable to SENATE RULES COMMITTEE.
Please include Senate Publication Number 765-S when ordering.